THE WOMAN'S COLLEGE OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
GREENSBORO, N. C.

PUBLICATIONS
OF THE
NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
BULLETIN No. 28

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Twentieth and Twenty-First Annual Sessions

OF THE

State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina

This book must not be taken from the building

RALEIGH
DECEMBER 2-3, 1920
DECEMBER 1-2, 1921

F
251
N95
v. 20-21

20-21
JACKSON LIBRARY-UNCG
3 0510 0243276X

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Twentieth and Twenty-First Annual Sessions

OF THE

State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina

RALEIGH

DECEMBER 2-3, 1920
DECEMBER 1-2, 1921

Compiled by
R. B. HOUSE, Secretary

RALEIGH
EDWARDS & BROUGHTON PRINTING COMPANY
STATE PRINTERS
1922

The North Carolina Historical Commission

J. Bryan Grimes, *Chairman*, Raleigh

D. H. Hill, Raleigh

M. C. S. Noble, Chapel Hill

T. M. Pittman, Henderson

Frank Wood, Edenton

D. H. Hill, *Secretary*, Raleigh.

Officers of the State Literary and Historical Association

1919-1920

President ..... J. G. deR. Hamilton, Chapel Hill.
First Vice-President ..... Mrs. S. Westray Battle, Asheville.
Second Vice-President ..... T. T. Hicks, Henderson.
Third Vice-President ..... Mrs. M. K. Myers, Washington.
Secretary-Treasurer ..... R. D. W. Connor, Raleigh.

Executive Committee

(With above named officers)

W. K. Boyd, Durham.
Mrs. H. G. Cooper, Oxford.
W. C. Smith, Greensboro.
F. B. McDowell, Charlotte.

Marshall DeL. Haywood, Raleigh.

1920-1921

President ..... D. H. Hill, Raleigh.
First Vice-President ..... Mrs. H. A. London, Pittsboro.
Second Vice-President ..... C. C. Pearson, Wake Forest.
Third Vice-President ..... Miss Gertrude Weil, Goldsboro.
Secretary-Treasurer ..... R. B. House, Raleigh.

Executive Committee

(With above named officers)

W. W. Pierson, Chapel Hill.
A. B. Andrews, Raleigh.
Burton Craige, Winston-Salem.
W. H. Glasson, Durham.
Josephus Daniels, Raleigh.
R. D. W. Connor, Chapel Hill.

Officers For 1921-1922

President ..... W. K. Boyd, Durham.
First Vice-President ..... S. A. Ashe, Raleigh.
Second Vice-President ..... Mrs. D. H. Blair, Greensboro.
Third Vice-President ..... John Jordan Douglas, Wadesboro.
Secretary-Treasurer ..... R. B. House, Raleigh.

Executive Committee

(With above named officers)

W. C. Jackson, Greensboro.
J. G. deR. Hamilton, Chapel Hill.
D. H. Hill, Raleigh.
Clarence Poe, Raleigh.
C. C. Pearson, Wake Forest.

PURPOSES OF THE STATE LITERARY AND HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

"The collection, preservation, production, and dissemination of State literature and history;

"The encouragement of public and school libraries;

"The establishment of an historical museum;

"The inculcation of a literary spirit among our people;

"The correction of printed misrepresentations concerning North Carolina; and,

"The engendering of an intelligent, healthy State pride in the rising generations."

ELIGIBILITY TO MEMBERSHIP—MEMBERSHIP DUES

All persons interested in its purposes are invited to become members of the Association. There are two classes of members: "Regular Members," paying one dollar a year, and "Sustaining Members," paying five dollars a year.

RECORD OF THE STATE LITERARY AND HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

(Organized October, 1900)

Fiscal Years	*Presidents*	*Secretaries*	*Paid-up Membership*
1900-1901	Walter Clark	Alex. J. Feild	150
1901-1902	Henry G. Connor	Alex. J. Feild	139
1902-1903	W. L. Poteat	George S. Fraps	73
1903-1904	C. Alphonso Smith	Clarence Poe	127
1904-1905	Robert W. Winston	Clarence Poe	109
1905-1906	Charles B. Aycock	Clarence Poe	185
1906-1907	W. D. Pruden	Clarence Poe	301
1907-1908	Robert Bingham	Clarence Poe	273
1908-1909	Junius Davis	Clarence Poe	311
1909-1910	Platt D. Walker	Clarence Poe	440
1910-1911	Edward K. Graham	Clarence Poe	425
1911-1912	R. D. W. Connor	Clarence Poe	479
1912-1913	W. P. Few	R. D. W. Connor	476
1913-1914	Archibald Henderson	R. D. W. Connor	435
1914-1915	Clarence Poe	R. D. W. Connor	412
1915-1916	Howard E. Rondthaler	R. D. W. Connor	501
1916-1917	H. A. London	R. D. W. Connor	521
1917-1918	James Sprunt	R. D. W. Connor	453
1918-1919	James Sprunt	R. D. W. Connor	377
1919-1920	J. G. deR. Hamilton	R. D. W. Connor	493
1920-1921	D. H. Hill	R. B. House	430
1921-1922	W. K. Boyd	R. B. House	

THE PATTERSON MEMORIAL CUP

THE CONDITIONS OF AWARD OFFICIALLY SET FORTH BY MRS. PATTERSON

To the President and Executive Committee of the Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina:

As a memorial to my father, and with a view to stimulating effort among the writers of North Carolina, and to awaken among the people of the State an interest in their own literature, I desire to present to your Society a loving cup upon the following stipulations, which I trust will meet with your approval, and will be found to be just and practicable:

1. The cup will be known as the "William Houston Patterson Memorial Cup."

2. It will be awarded at each annual meeting of your Association for ten successive years, beginning with October, 1905.

3. It will be given to that resident of the State who during the twelve months from September 1st of the previous year to September 1st of the year of the award has displayed, either in prose or poetry, without regard to its length, the greatest excellence and the highest literary skill and genius. The work must be published during the said twelve months, and no manuscript nor any unpublished writings will be considered.

4. The name of the successful competitor will be engraved upon the cup, with the date of award, and it will remain in his possession until October 1st of the following year, when it shall be returned to the Treasurer of the Association, to be by him held in trust until the new award of your annual meeting that month. It will become the permanent possession of the one winning it oftenest during the ten years, provided he shall have won it three times. Should no one, at the expiration of that period, have won it so often, the competition shall continue until that result is reached. The names of only those competitors who shall be living at the time of the final award shall be considered in the permanent disposition of the cup.

5. The Board of Award shall consist of the President of the Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina, who will act as chairman, and of the occupants of the Chairs of English Literature at the University of North Carolina, at Davidson College, at Wake Forest College, and at the State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts at Raleigh, and of the Chairs of History at the University of North Carolina and Trinity College.

6. If any of these gentlemen should decline or be unable to serve, their successors shall be appointed by the remaining members of the Board, and these appointees may act for the whole unexpired term or for a shorter time, as the Board may determine. Notice of the inability of any member to act must be given at the beginning of the year during which he declines to serve, so that there may be a full committee during the entire term of each year.

7. The publication of a member of the Board will be considered and passed upon in the same manner as that of any other writer.

MRS. J. LINDSAY PATTERSON.

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOLUTION

According to a resolution adopted at the 1908 session of the Literary and Historical Association, it is also provided that no author desiring to have his work considered in connection with the award of the cup shall communicate with any member of the committee, either personally or through a representative. Books or other publications to be considered, together with any communications regarding them, must be sent to the Secretary of the Association and by him presented to the chairman of the committee for consideration.

AWARDS OF THE PATTERSON MEMORIAL CUP

1905—John Charles McNeill, for poems later reprinted in book form as "Songs, Merry and Sad."

1906—Edwin Mims, for "Life of Sidney Lanier."

1907—Kemp Plummer Battle, for "History of the University of North Carolina."

1908—Samuel A'Court Ashe, for "History of North Carolina."

1909—Clarence Poe, for "A Southerner in Europe."

1910—R. D. W. Connor, for "Cornelius Harnett: An Essay in North Carolina History."

1911—Archibald Henderson, for "George Bernard Shaw: His Life and Works."

1912—Clarence Poe, for "Where Half the World is Waking Up."

1913—Horace Kephart, for "Our Southern Highlanders."

1914—J. G. deR. Hamilton, for "Reconstruction in North Carolina,"

1915—William Louis Poteat, for "The New Peace."

1916—No award.

1917—Mrs. Olive Tilford Dargan, for "The Cycle's Rim."

1918—No Award.

1919—No Award.

1920—Miss Winifred Kirkland, for "The New Death."

1921—No Award.

WHAT THE ASSOCIATION HAS ACCOMPLISHED FOR THE STATE—SUCCESSFUL MOVEMENTS INAUGURATED BY IT

1. Rural libraries.
2. "North Carolina Day" in the schools.
3. The North Carolina Historical Commission.
4. Vance statue in Statuary Hall.
5. Fire-proof State Library Building and Hall of Records.
6. Civil War battle-fields marked to show North Carolina's record.
7. North Carolina's war record defended and war claims vindicated.
8. Patterson Memorial Cup.

Contents

	Page
Minutes of the Twentieth Annual Session	9
Vitality in State History. By J. G. deR. Hamilton	11
What the World Wants of the United States. By John Spencer Bassett	20
Patriotism. By John Erskine	33
William Richardson Davie. By H. M. Wagstaff	46
An Eighteenth Century Circuit Rider. By Frank Nash	58
North Carolina Bibliography, 1919-1920. By Mary B. Palmer	72
Minutes of the Twenty-First Annual Session	72
Confederate Ordnance Department. By D. H. Hill	80
An Ode. By Benjamin Sledd	92
North Carolina Bibliography, 1920-1921. By Mary B. Palmer	94
The Historian and the Daily Press. By Gerald W. Johnson	97
An Old Time North Carolina Election. By Louise Irby	102
Raleigh and Roanoke. By John Jordan Douglass	112
The Bread and Butter Aspect of North Carolina. By D. D. Carroll	119
Members 1920-1921	124

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/publications-of-the-north-carolina-historical-commission_1922_28

Proceedings and Addresses of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina

Minutes of the Twentieth Annual Session Raleigh, December 2-3, 1920

THURSDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 2ND.

The twentieth annual session of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina was called to order in the auditorium of the Woman's Club, Raleigh, N. C., Thursday evening, December 2nd, 1920, at 8:00 o'clock, President J. G. deR. Hamilton in the chair. The session was opened with an invocation by Rev. W. W. Peele, Pastor of Edenton Street Methodist Church, Raleigh. Dr. Hamilton then read the president's annual address. His subject was "Vitality in State History". He was followed by Dr. John Spencer Bassett, Professor of History, Smith College, Northampton, Mass., whose subject was "What the World Wants of the United States".

At the conclusion of Dr. Bassett's paper an informal reception was held for the members of the State Literary and Historical Association, the North Carolina Folk Lore Society, and the North Carolina Library Association, in the club building.

FRIDAY MORNING, DECEMBER 3RD.

The session was called to order in the Hall of the State Senate by President Hamilton, at 11 o'clock. The President presented Dr. H. M. Wagstaff of the University of North Carolina, who read a paper on, "Davie and Federalism." Dr. Wagstaff was followed by Mr. Frank Nash, Assistant Attorney General of North Carolina, who read a paper entitled "An Eighteenth Century Circuit Rider". The president then presented Miss Mary B. Palmer, Secretary of the North Carolina Library Commission, who read "North Carolina Bibliography, 1919—1920".

At the conclusion of the exercises Dr. D. T. Smithwick of Louisburg, presented the following resolution:

To the members of the State Literary and Historical Association:

I find no provision for the election of honorary members of our Association, and thinking there are a number of people who are eligible and

have gained distinction, maybe native North Carolinians in other states, whose connection with us would be of great value, I feel it would be wise for us at this meeting to make some provisions for election of honorary and life members.

Therefore, make this motion, that the newly elected President and executive committee to be constituted a committee to make a report to our next meeting, with suitable provision for election of honorary members and the qualifications of such persons proposed for membership.

D. T. SMITHWICK, Louisburg, N. C.

The resolution was passed. The president then appointed a nominating committee with instructions to report their nominations of officers for the succeeding year at the evening meeting. This committee was as follows: Mr. Frank Nash, Dr. C. C. Pearson, and Dr. J. M. McConnell.

FRIDAY EVENING, DECEMBER 3RD.

President Hamilton called the meeting to order at 8:30 in the auditorium of Meredith College. He then introduced Dr. John Erskine, of Columbia University, who read an address entitled "Patriotism".

At the conclusion of Dr. Erskine's paper the nominating committee reported the following nominations, which were unanimously carried: President, D. H. Hill, Raleigh; First Vice-President, Mrs. H. A. London, Pittsboro; Second Vice-President, C. C. Pearson, Wake Forest; Third Vice President, Miss Gertrude Weil, Goldsboro; Secretary Treasurer, R. B. House, Raleigh.

The Association then adjourned *sine die*.

ADDRESSES

Vitality in State History *

By J. G. deR. Hamilton
President State Literary and Historical Association

Almost from the time that conscious historical study began there has been argument as to the nature, value, and content of history which has not yet resulted in any agreement universally accepted. It still means to many people one or another of a large number of things, many of which it is not. Doubtless there are many persons present who can recall a time when the name denoted nothing save a dreary catalogue of wars and battles, of dynasties and administrations, of isolated and perfectly insulated names and dates. To one who has never reached conceptions of history more advanced than this, my subject could have little or no meaning, for if that be the only content of history, truly there is no vitality in it.

Of great interest and intensity has been the discussion on the subject of the purpose and value of history. Opinions have ranged from that which has held it a purely cultural subject, full of scholarly detachment from the supposedly tainting touch of anything practical and useful, but replete from interest to many individuals properly educated up to it, all the way to the various views of a more utilitarian character. These are many. Probably the most widespread is that the value of history lies in its service as a guide of conduct in matters of statecraft. Other claims made for it have been that it is calculated to discipline the memory, stimulate the imagination, and develop the judgment; to give training in the use of books; to furnish entertainment; to set up for conscious imitation ideals of conduct and of social service; to inculcate practical knowledge that can be turned to account in the daily concerns of life; to illuminate other studies; to enrich the humanity of the student, enlarge his vision, incline him to charitable views of his neighbors, to give him a love of truth, to make him in general an intelligent well-disposed citizen of the world by making him a citizen of the ages.

Another, widely prevalent for a time in the recent past, is that history teaches patriotism and should be written and taught with that

* The author desires to express his sense of obligation for aid received in the preparation of this paper from the following works: James Harvey Robinson, "The New History;" Dewey, "Reconstruction in Philosophy;" Frederic Harrison, "The Meaning of History;" and Henry Johnson, "Teaching of History."

end almost solely in view. Let me turn aside briefly from my subject to remark that history made to order for the teaching of patriotism is likely to bear as little relation to truth as its resulting effects bear to essential patriotism. An outraged world has, in the greatest war of history, repudiated and punished the most striking example of this sort of history teaching and this sort of patriotism. It remains for patriotic Americans to see that we do not err in the same direction.

From the beginning of history writing to the point where a broad conception of values in history in relation to man's environment and daily life appeared was a slow development. In the beginning history was held to be literature, art, poetry, which preserved the record of certain dramatic events, chiefly the heroic actions of kings, warriors, and statesmen. It sought to paint a picture, "to consecrate a noble past," rather than to guide or furnish a key to the future. But in the eighteenth century a fresh point of view influenced historical study. The aim was no longer so much to paint a picture as it was to solve a problem—to explain the steps of national growth and prosperity or their reverse. Under the influence of this ideal every factor of national importance came to be regarded as valuable as a field for investigation and study, and thus was ushered in the day when history was generally held to be the story of people rather than of kings. The same period has seen likewise the steady increase of emphasis upon social factors other than political and religious, and the consequent rise of the group emphasized—in some cases overemphasized—the economic interpretation of the development of the human race. Here, too, received a mighty impulse that synthetic process of associating cause and effect which transformed history from mere annals into a connected whole.

None of these views of history are as a whole true or yet untrue. In every point of view there are clear values, but in no one of them is the whole truth found. Take for instance the cultural aspect of historical study. The usual view of this fits with the most selfish view of education ever held, and has in its extreme form little truth, for knowledge that does not connect with life and its problems, that does not tend to give sounder notions of human and social interests, is meaningless. Bolingbroke thus describes it:

> "An application to any study that tends neither to make us better men and better citizens is at best but an ingenious sort of idleness . . . . and the knowledge that we acquire by it is a creditable kind of ignorance, nothing more. This creditable kind of ignorance is, in my opinion, the whole benefit which the generality of men, even the most learned, reap from the study of history."

Still, viewed from another light, it is in individual culture, training, and education that history yields its richest values. Bolingbroke saw this, and continued:

"And yet, the study of history seems to me of all others the most proper to train us up to private and public virtues."

Nor, to go to the other extreme, does the utilitarian claim lack validity, except in so far as it claims too much. For in the last analysis, if history is to have values for the average man, and it is in relation to the average man or the mass of men that I discuss this subject, it must be practically useful and in a social sense it can be considered important only in so far as it meets that requirement.

If the values of history be estimated rightly there is really little or no conflict between the cultural and utilitarian views. But what *is* the value of historical study and knowledge? *Is* an acquaintance with the events, men, and ideas of the past of benefit to those in the world today? There is little difficulty in answering these questions. There is widespread agreement that the study of history does cultivate the mind, develop clear thinking, and give capacity to estimate the character of social movements and forces. It does fulfill almost every claim made for it. Knowledge of history lifts its possessor to a height from which, detached and aloof from the turmoil and uproar of his immediate environment, he can comprehend the nature of existent institutions and conditions, and can trace the forces which operate in the life and progress of nations and of the world for good and evil. As few other acquirements it tends to the development of wholesome tolerance. It enables him to play a constructive, positive part in the formation and maintenance of effective public opinion, that compelling social and political force. But a widespread belief that from the study of past events sufficient knowledge may be acquired to meet the new problems which arise is true only as far as this: experience in the analysis of past movements and conditions develops a capacity to analyze similarly the movements and conditions of the present. In the words of Lecky:

"The same method which furnishes a key to the past forms also an admirable discipline for the judgment of the present. He who has learnt to understand the true character and tendencies of many succeeding ages is not likely to go very far wrong in estimating his own."

In other words, the past does not furnish exact precedents for conduct in meeting similar situations, because similar situations rarely or never arise. History cannot accurately be said to repeat itself. But

historical study has value because through it we may gain such a knowledge of the past that our conduct may be based upon complete understanding of existing conditions.

As concrete examples of the value of historical study, take the cases of Jefferson and Madison. Both were profound students of history and both applied practically their knowledge in striking fashion and with such success that their names are held in honor and the world would have been a far poorer place had they been less informed on the subject. Yet the conditions which they faced had never had any parallel in history. Their use of history lay in the capacity which it gave them to analyze situations and conditions accurately and, while adapting themselves to their environment, at the same time shape it for the future. A not less significant example is that of a living American who has won the moral leadership of the world and a glorious immortality.

If there be here present any who doubt the value of historical knowledge, let them remember that out of history have come our daily life, our laws, our customs, our thought, our habits of mind, our beliefs, our moral sense, our ideas of right and wrong, our hopes and aspirations. Let them conceive, if it be humanly possible, of a world from which has been swept away every vestige of what may properly be called historical knowledge, from which was gone, not alone the knowledge of the great events, but all records and the very memory of the great movements and achievements of the past in literature, art, science, and industry; of all customs, traditions, laws, and institutions; of religion; of all human hopes and human beliefs. Can imagination create a picture of greater and more hopeless confusion and woe?

History, rightly employed, contains the alkahest of the present and of the future.

So much for the values of history. What of its content?

History has been defined as "All we know about everything man has ever done, or seen, or thought, or hoped, or felt." There are many definitions still more inclusive, as, "History is the sum total of human activity," or, "History in its broadest sense is everything that ever happened. It is the past itself, whatever that is." Accepting for the purposes of this discussion the first and narrower definition, it is clearly an impossibility for any man to acquire knowledge of all history, and the mass of men must be content with far less. What of all the things that man has done, seen, thought, hoped, or felt, have values for the average man? The dramatic? The unusual? The heroic? Or, on the other hand, the normal? The customary? The humdrum con-

ditions of life for the mass of men? What is the test—the acid test—which shall determine what is pure metal and what is mere dross?

As I see it, vitality is the final test to be applied, and by vitality I mean that character in event or movement which makes it a determining factor, for good or for evil, in the shaping of the conditions, present and future, of the generation in which one lives, which gives sounder notions of human and social interests, which relates man to the business of living. It is no narrow definition. It covers a multitude of meanings. It may consist, for example, in satisfying the natural human curiosity as to the deeper relationships of the things about us, the facts of our environment, and their connection with the past—"that power which to understand is strength, which to repudiate is weakness". Vital events, vital movements, vital conditions, are the only ones which are worthy of widespread study and assimilation so far as the generality of men are concerned.

Applying this test, it will be found that the dramatic, the unusual, and even the heroic events of the past have far less vital importance than is usually attributed to them, while the normal conditions of life lie at the heart of all the great movements which have shaped the past and through it the present. And so the man who uses history rightly values events not for their dramatic interest but for the light they cast on the normal conditions which lay back of them and caused them. And knowledge of these conditions is chiefly valuable for the grasp it gives of the ways in which society functions and of their influence upon the present. The aim is not the knowledge of the past; knowledge is a mere means towards the end of full living. The end of it all is that, through a more perfect understanding of our environment, we may develop sounder notions of human and social interests and the capacity to "coöperate with the vital principle of betterment," both in enriching our environment and adapting ourselves to its necessities, in order that we may grow. For, here as elsewhere, growth is the moral end. The value of the past lies not in itself but in our todays and tomorrows. Thus those things which touch directly the life of the world of today or of the future and which may bring or retard growth are vital to us.

John Richard Green saw this, and in his "Short History of the English People" said:

"If I have said little of the glories of Cressy, it is because I have dwelt much on the wrongs and misery which prompted the verse of Langland and the preaching of Ball. . . . I have set Shakespere among the heroes of the Elizabethan age and placed the scientific inquiries of the

Royal Society side by side with the victories of the New Model. If some of the conventional figures of military and political history occupy in my pages less than the space usually given them, it is because I have had to find a place for figures little heeded in common history . . . the figures of the missionary, the poet, the painter, the merchant, or the philosopher."

If these conclusions are true, as I earnestly believe they are, it is clearly apparent that there has been a vast waste of time and energy in the effort to instil historical knowledge into the minds of the mass of men. Anyone who is familiar with history as it is generally written and taught will bear me out in the statement that it has too often emphasized the unusual at the expense of the normal; that it has been long on events and short on movements; that it has, more often than not, lacked any clear distinction between the vital and the meaningless; that it has not given the student the type of training and knowledge which he can apply to the problems which he must confront. In short, we have been too often content to attempt to give information and have not sought to stimulate the development of real knowledge capable of practical application to life.

Nowhere have the misconceptions as to the place, function, and value of historical study been more apparent and more striking than in the field of the history of the States of the American Union, and this in spite of the fact that the span of years of the oldest of them has been so short that it is not beyond the power of anyone to acquaint himself with its whole course to the present. Nor are the sources of their history lost and their origins wrapped in doubt and mystery. In the case of every one of them it is the brief story of the development of a people, so simple to be mastered that it is almost true that he who runs may read. It is also a fact easily to be proved, I think, that widespread knowledge of state history among its citizens is not only practicable, but that its possibilities in the way of good results to the commonwealth are boundless.

Take the case of our own commonwealth, North Carolina. If the things which I have indicated constitute the vital in history, must we not revise our past attitude towards the history of the state as we have taught it and chiefly emphasized it? Let us ask ourselves frankly if we have not been inclined to emphasize in that history the things which are, if vital at all, of secondary importance in reaching correct judgments concerning the things which have made us what we are, or concerning the problems of the state today. As a result of the teaching of our history does the average North Carolinian have any background of knowledge and training by which he can analyze existing

situations in order to base opinion concerning them and conduct in relation to them upon a sure foundation? Have we not, in a too eager desire for primacy, too frequently selected for emphasis happenings which have had little or no real influence on the later life of our people, which play no part in our life today? Similarly, have we not ignored the conditions, movements, and tendencies which have vitality, which would serve to explain to us why we are what we are, an analysis of which might render us more capable of shaping our destiny for the better? Frankly, have we not sought to write and teach the things calculated to develop a sort of purposeless ancestor worship, to breed perfect contentment, a smug satisfaction with what we are and have been, rather than to emphasize the larger and more significant facts calculated to breed dissatisfaction, a divine discontent which might lead us faster along the paths of progress?

For the evidence is overwhelming that our past has not been all glorious, and that its inglorious features rather than their reverse have constituted a large part of the normal conditions which have shaped our present.

We are reminded at every sight of the state flag that we claim certain primacies in the struggle against the mother country in defense of the principle of no taxation without representation. It is a fact far more vital to our present that from 1776 to 1920—nearly a century and a half—we have lived under a self-imposed system of taxation which in iniquity has far surpassed anything that the Crown and Parliament of Great Britain in their most arbitrary and supposedly tyrannical mood ever dreamed of imposing on us.

Again, we emphasize the individualistic tendencies of our people as indicating a love of liberty, but we fail to show that it has manifested itself most notably in our inability to organize effectively for the common good, to develop any widespread civic consciousness and civic responsibility, to see in taxation a method of cooperative support of a cooperative undertaking for the general welfare. Rather we have viewed taxes as an imposition which it was right at any cost of morals to evade, and, as a result, have lived for most of our years, through the denial of opportunity to the majority of our citizens, in a state of servitude. Perhaps you ask, "Liberty loving North Carolina in *servitude?*" Yes, the servitude which is of all those of the ages the most grinding, depressing, and enduring, the servitude imposed by ignorance, which throughout our history has held us, as a commonwealth, tied and bound in its chains. It has not been confined

to the ignorant. Those it has crushed utterly, cutting them off from their God-given heritage of freedom, and denying to them and their children liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and in many cases life itself, all three of which we have solemnly declared in the Declaration of Independence to be inalienable rights of mankind. It has imposed upon the rest—the enlightened—as well, a heavy burden—that of carrying the dead weight of the whole, and of seeing all their ambitions for North Carolina's swift advancement die as the gravity of the load irresistibly held them back on the paths of progress until in many cases hope itself died.

In the same way, we have constantly reminded ourselves and the world that North Carolina was first at Bethel, farthest at Gettysburg and Chickamauga, and last at Appomattox. I yield to none in my deep pride and reverence for those men who so nobly and heroically carried the banners of a lost cause, but I submit in all seriousness that their achievements are not so vital in our history as are the facts that North Carolina has been at times first in mortality from typhoid fever and homicides, farthest for a long stretch of years in white adult male illiteracy, and at least close to last in recognizing the overwhelming importance of the great social purposes for which modern government may be said to exist.

We have all heard of late constant boasting of our fine economy in government. It is a far more vital fact that we have spent less for the larger social aims of government than any other state save one, for there lies the explanation of illiteracy, poverty, the steady loss of population that drained our life blood through a large part of our history, the failure to develop the almost fabulous natural resources of the state, the loss of opportunity to millions among whom were doubtless innumerable unhonored and unsung Murpheys, Vances, and Aycocks. We have needed desperately all of these millions, trained and equipped for constructive citizenship, but more desperately still have we felt the lack of missing leaders. Their loss is irreparable.

Finally, we have heard much within the last few years of the startling figures of our Federal taxes as illustrative of our prosperity. The figures are indeed startling when the vital fact is presented that the Federal taxes paid in the state during the last year amounted to more by twenty-five million dollars than the state has spent in its whole history for the compelling duty of educating its children; and the further fact that the amount paid in the last two years to the United States in taxes is greater than all that has been expended in North Carolina for both public and private education combined since Amadas and Barlowe first saw the green island of Roanoke.

These are characteristic instances—extreme ones, if you will—of the tendency I have indicated, of our failure to apply the test of validity. All of these and many, many more are vital factors in our history. For every one of them touches us closely today; all have had significant effects upon our environment, our opportunity, our character as a people, upon our whole life. The burden of them will rest upon our children do what we will.

Do not misunderstand me. The day will never come, and never ought to come, when we shall fail to recognize and be properly proud of the deeds and lives which are the spot lights of our history. But their brightness must not so dazzle us as to blind us to the existence of the skeleton in our closet. The dead past cannot in such a case bury its own dead; that is our task. Growth and progress demand that we face the fact of their existence, and seek for them burial and, it may be, through our reformation and expiation, final oblivion. But until we recognize their vitality even in death, history cannot through the training of our citizens pour out upon us its richest bounty.

To those of the past we owe, perchance, a debt which we can never pay; but no payment is demanded other than that of emulation of their virtues and of being warned by their faults; of remedying the wrongs they committed, of rectifying their errors, and of fulfilling the things that they omitted to do. *Our* great debt is to those who are yet to come, and it is in the light of history that we must pay that debt. In behalf of your children and mine, of the generation yet unborn, let us in North Carolina learn the vital things, and so far as in us lies, set about righting of the wrongs, the undoing of the mistakes, and the doing of all the things that have been left undone in the achievement of liberty and justice.

But the task of emphasizing the vital things is not one merely of the historical specialist or even of the teacher; it is rather the responsibility of all who love North Carolina. The objective of all our historical study of the state must be refixed and restated. In our schools, in our colleges, among our people generally, emphasis must be laid upon the vital, and the past thus linked with the present for the sake of the future.

The end of it all should be to show, not alone wherein North Carolina is first, but rather the reason for her lagging anywhere, that the means for improvement may be found; to give to her sons and daughters, not only information as to how great she is, but, more vital still, the knowledge of how through their efforts and their lives she may become far greater.

What the World Wants of the United States

By John Spencer Bassett, Ph.D., LL.D.

Professor of American History, Smith College

The elections of 1920 have come and gone. They always come and go once in four years in this country of ours, whether we need them or not. We have heard the results, and if we are good Americans we have accepted them, whether we wished them or not. This is our country, the country of all the people, and when the people have spoken in their elections the individual citizen accepts the result. If he is a good citizen he ceases to debate the execution of the decision of the voters. It is only when the election comes around that he can again bring the matter into question and debate the wisdom of the policy that has been followed, or that is proposed for future adoption. I make this plain statement in the beginning because I wish you to follow me into the discussion of the evening with minds clear of any party leanings.

Since the war with Spain, twenty-two years ago, the foreign relations of the United States have steadily enlarged. Much has been said recently about "entanglements with foreign nations." But for twenty-two years we have been steadily entangling ourselves with other nations, binding up our future in certain well defined policies which we cannot change at this time without seriously compromising our honor and interests. We have announced our support of an "open door" in the East in such terms that we should be deeply humiliated as a nation if we had to give it up at the demand of other nations. We have steadily tied ourselves up in the Caribbean Sea by assuming what are in fact the relations of protectorates over Cuba, Santo Domingo, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Panama. We have become responsible for the development of the Philippine Islands into a country capable of self government; and in doing so we have undertaken to protect them while under our own control; and if we are able to carry out our announced purpose of making them independent in due time, we shall have to continue that protection as against the designs of ambitious neighbors. In all these respects the United States have accepted obligations in keeping with the powers of a great nation. What has been done has alarmed nobody. It has come about gradually, and the states immediately concerned with us are not strong enough to be dangerous. But no one knows how soon the obligations we have taken may run counter

to the interests of a great power in such a way that our utmost strength would be necessary to sustain us if the worst came to worst in the course we have mapped out.

It is also noteworthy that in assuming protectorates over these states we have acted for our own interests only in an ideal sense. That is, there is no immediate necessity for establishing a protectorate over any of the states named, except Panama, where the protection of the canal is a matter of immediate policy. In regard to the other states we have acted because sagacity shows us that in the long run it is for our interests to have Cuba, Santo Domingo, and the Philippines exist in a state of enlightened prosperity, and for that reason we feel justified in lending our strength in promoting and guiding with a firm hand, if necessary, the development of these states. No one objects to this policy, so far as I know.

Our latest notable extension of our relations with the rest of the world was in entering the world war. We did not do it because we wished to, but because it was forced upon us by the bald necessity of the case. The origin of the struggle was not of our making. It grew out of a rivalry as old as the centuries. Its seeds were planted and replanted in the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Treaty of San Stefano, the Congress of Berlin, 1878, and in the negotiations connected with the end of the Balkan war of 1912—1913. The desire for Constantinople, the jealousies of the Great Powers, the cultivation of national chauvinism, the false theory that Balance of Power can preserve peace: all these things were not things of our making, and they were fundamentally connected with the origin of the war. We came into it when it had become a life and death struggle for world empire on the part of Germany. If she won no state's life was safe; so we believed in 1917, and when she played her last card—ruthless submarine warfare—we were called to strike or eat words that only a coward could swallow. And so we fought and gave a decisive turn to the war. When we entered it with energy, in the summer of 1918, the two sides were near the point of exhaustion, but the advantage was with Germany. We changed the odds by throwing our fresh and unexhausted strength into the struggle; and the world was made secure from the Teutonic threat.

Then rose a situation no one had expected in a very definite manner. The tenseness of the struggle, the exhaustion it created in all the belligerent states, the misplacing of business and political interrelation, and the threatening rise of a proletarian regime all had to be dealt with. What was going to be the position of the United States

in this settlement? Many of us have asked the question and some have tried to answer it, some on one side and some on another. It has been two years and more since the silence of peace settled over No Man's Land, but to this day it is not determined what shall be the attitude of the United States to the problems that face the world in its hour of restoration. We have been so lost in the meshes of the great political debate that we have forgotten to consider the fundamental situation that lies behind all our contention. It is a situation that would exist, with or without a League of Nations. It would exist with an Association of Nations: It would exist if we set up a world court without the power of coercion. It would exist, but in another way, if it was decided that no formal attempts at international cooperation would be made. It is always there, in the fringes of the present, where today runs into tomorrow, and we cannot know too clearly what claims it has upon our sympathy and interests. The people are the rulers. It is we who have to understand so that we may decide. In its largest and most apparent phase it is closely connected with the world's industrial life; and we cannot do better than consider for a few minutes in what respect international industry stands today in a situation of abnormality, and in what respect our own interests are involved in its critical condition.

The mechanism of international commerce is the product of long experience. It depends upon the proper adjustment of international finance, trade, credits, the supply of raw materials, hopefulness, transportation, and various other activities. One of its noticeable qualities is its tendency to go in the channels in which it has been in the habit of going. For example, when the people of a certain state have become used to buying and using the merchandise of a certain other state, it is very difficult to get them to drop what they have been using and begin to use mechandise that comes from a third state, even though it may be possible to prove that the merchandise of the third country is better in itself. It is not often in the history of industry that we encounter a general shaking up of trade conditions, giving us the possibility of making new adjustments without a long period of struggle to capture markets.

But it is just at such a situation that the world has arrived today, not through its choice, but through its necessities. Countries that formerly were firmly established in all the phases of industry are now in severe straits. The manufacturing, transportation and credit facilities of the continent of Europe are in a confused condition. It will take them several years to regain the state of equilibrium, and while they are coming to that happy state the United States have a wonderful opportunity

to get and hold a footing there, which at later time could be obtained only by a process of severe competition.

Whether we do or do not utilize the opportunity before us depends primarily on our business men; but not entirely. It depends to a notable extent on the attitude of the people of the country. Unquestionably there are a few people in the United Sattes who would deliberately and knowingly block our progress in this respect. But there are many who could block it by not knowing what the situation is and how their own views of what the government ought to do in the situation bear upon it. It is our good fortune to live under a government of the people. Well, at this moment the people of this country are called upon to decide whether or not they shall block or promote the development of the United States in keeping with the industrial and political opportunities that confront us in international affairs. With the best intentions in the world our people cannot be expected to act prudently in the matter unless they understand the opportunities that confront us.

Before 1914 the United States was a debtor nation. For years we had borrowed money to build railroads, canals and industrial plants, and to develop mining and agriculture. For the interest on our borrowings we had to pay Europe annually more than $250,000,000. Whatever else we did this money had to be paid. We fulfilled the description involved in the biblical phrase, "The borrower is a servant of the lender." We had chosen, also, to put our best efforts into manufacturing, as some sections of our farmers put all their efforts in production of one crop, expecting to buy what they needed in other respects. Thus we had given up the operation of a merchant marine and were paying Europeans $200,000,000 a year to carry our goods to market. This interest charge and this freight bill, with the amount of money our tourists took abroad with them and some other items, made a grand total of nearly $600,000,000 a year.

The sum was so great that it was impossible to pay it in gold, the only international money. To have tried to do so would have exhausted the stock of gold in the country in a few years, which means that our banks would have been forced to suspend specie payments of their notes. It was about nine times as much as the amount of gold mined in this country annually. The other alternative was to pay it in commodities; and that is what we did. Every year we sent abroad $600,000,000 worth of products in excess of the value of the merchandise we imported. If we did not quite make the total out-go and the total in-come balance we called the difference the balance of trade. If the prices of our commodities were low the result was that they did not sell for enough to pay all we owed for merchandise

imported and for the stated obligations, and we said that the balance of trade was against us. If they sold for more than we owed the balance of trade was in our favor. When it was against us we sent gold abroad to pay it, when it was in our favor we received gold to make up the balance. There were times of great uneasiness when the balance against us was large and the drain of our gold outward was heavy.

The day Europe broke into war our long period of bondage began to mend. Europe now began to buy from us far more heavily than we were buying from her. Desiring to keep her gold in Europe she began to send back to us the bonds we had sold her, and on which we were paying interest. During the first three years of the war she more than canceled the debt we had owed her before the war began. At the same time we were forced to think of our own shipping. We built it up until we ceased to rely on other countries, and thus we saved in our own pockets the larger part of the freight bill we had formerly paid. But the steady stream of orders for American merchandise continued to pour into our offices, and by the time the third year of war was beginning Europe was forced to go on a borrowing basis. We now became the lender, and Europe became the borrower. From having been forced through many years to wait upon the pleasure of others, we were in a position to have others wait upon our pleasure.

In May, 1917, the United States had been in the war one month. Great men from London, Paris, Rome and other cities, some of which we had to get down atlasses to know where they were, began to arrive in Washington. They told us many important things about how to carry on the war into which we had entered; but they were all urgent for loans. The big states wanted big loans, the little states would take anything we had to offer. And to all of them our government lent according to their necessities. The British came first, and the newspapers announced that they wished to borrow £50,000,000. The response in the press was favorable and it was announced that they wished £100,000,000. After a few days it was stated that the United States government had decided to lend them $500,000,000. Probably some of us did not at the time notice the change in terms. The value of the pound is determined by the British parliament: the value of the dollar is determined by the congress of the United States. It was thought just as well that the borrower did not have the power to fix the value of his own debt symbol. The incident marks the change of position that had occurred in the financial relations of the two nations. For the first time in many years Great

Britain was not in the position to dictate. She had to accept dictation, which is the ordinary fate of the debtor.

At last the war ended. The horrible wound on the face of the earth, running from the borders of Switzerland to the North Sea, ceased to bleed. Through it humanity had been yielding up its life for more than four years. It remained to be seen if the patient had been reduced to such a state of weakness that death would come of sheer weakness. For more than two years we have been watching with anxiety the struggle between exhaustion and the recuperative powers of nature. It is only with the approach of a new spring season, that we are beginning to feel that the crisis is about to pass favorably; but the patient is greatly in need of nourishment, and if he does not get it ugly complications are possible.

The situation of the world today may be summed up as follows: In 1913 the aggregate debt of the nations of the world was $43,200,-931,000; since the war, by the best available information it is $279,-014,908,000, an increase of about $236,000,000,000. The United Kingdom of Great Britain, which was believed to be heavily in debt in 1913 at $3,485 millions, now owes $39,314 millions. France owed then $6,346 millions: she now owes $46,025 millions. Italy then owed $2,921 millions: she now owes $18,102 millions. Germany, including the German states, before the war owed $5,048 millions: she now owes on the same basis $59,861 millions. The smaller of the belligerent nations have, in general, been forced to increase their indebtedness in the same relative manner. Nations that were believed to be burdened to the limit of prosperity in 1913 have increased their obligation from six to eleven times as much as they then owed. With industry prostrate they have to assume the increased burden. On a population filled with discontent they have to lay new and heavy taxes, with the danger that a despairing electorate may run into the extremes of radicalism and solve their difficulties by repudiating the whole obligation. It is a situation demanding patience and wise assistance from whatever source available.

From this distressed condition of Europe turn the eye to the United States. In 1913 their debt was $1,028 millions: in 1920 it was $24,299 millions. For the time we were in the war the rate at which it plunged us in debt was exceedingly high. If we had been in from the first, and the same rate ratio had maintained through the whole war, which is not probable, we should have increased our debt by more than $62,000,000,000, the interest on which at five per cent, would have amounted to $3,100 millions a year. And this

would mean that every man, woman and child in the country would pay on an average of $30 a year in taxes merely to pay the interest on the war debt. Such a burden, heavy as it seems, would not be heavier than the burden before which Europe shudders.

. The United States, however, came out of the war without having impaired seriously their powers of production. In fact, so carefully had those powers been stimulated during the war that we are today, as respects manufacturing plants and the mastery of the resources of nature, in a better position than ever before to meet the demands on our processes of production. During the war we improved the processes of agriculture, so that a man with the same amount of land can make more of a given product than before the war. At the same time we have materially enlarged our manufacturing plants, drawing into them rapidly the working population at the expense of rural industries. By the census statistics just made public 51% of the population of the country now live in towns and cities; that is less than half of the people in the country are producing the food on which the 51% of the population must live. We are thus about to arrive at the stage of development to which Alexander Hamilton looked forward in his Report on Manufactures—when we can more is, less than half of the people in the country are producing the food its wants in food products.

For a time after peace came to the world, the demand for our commodities came freely from the utmost parts of the world. We could sell all we could produce, and more. We have never been able to satisfy the demand. Today there are people in Europe who are in dire distress for merchandise that we can make, although our mills are closed down or on part time, because they cannot sell to those who have nothing with which to pay. Thus it happens that textile mills in New England are closing down, while people in Poland are shivering in their outworn and threadbare garments.

The outward expression of such a situation is the rate of exchange. In normal times nations balance their accounts by figuring the values of their respective units of money on a basis of the gold value in them. When, however, the foreign nation has not the goods to export to another nation in payment for what it imports, nor the gold with which to settle the balance of trade, it stops buying from that nation. When it sees such a cessation as a possibility, it tends to check its advance by raising the rate of exchange. For example, in normal times, when France buys from us about what she sells to us, she counts five francs as approximately equal to our dollar. When her citizens find that

it is hard to get bills on New York, that is bills to pay for what France has exported to the United States they begin to offer higher sums than five francs for a dollar. They may offer six or ten if their necessities are great. in these days they are offering, and paying daily, more than sixteen francs for a dollar. American imports are costing the French people very dearly. They are costing them so much that there has been a great shrinkage of orders for them. It is not likely that there will be a change until the French are able to send us their own goods more freely than they can now send them. Our industrial relations with France are similar to our relations with most other countries. Everywhere, despite the fact that we are not running factories on full time we are sending out vastly more than we sent before the war, and more than we are receiving. The world's balance of trade is in our favor to a large amount.

At the same time we have a large account against the rest of the world for interest on the loans made by our government during the war.

The amount of these loans in round numbers is $9,711,000,000 although a slight reduction has been made in some of them through readjustments. At the same time increased borrowing in private accounts in our money markets has increased still more the amount of our interest account against Europe. Combining the two items it is estimated that we are in a position to demand about $600,000,000 annually from Europe in payment of interest. At present we are not collecting the interest on our public lendings. If that were demanded it would put the rate of exchange still higher. While we forego it, however, it is being paid by the faithful American taxpayer to the amount of about $405,000,000 a year.

Such is the business situation today in the world. Europe is wounded to the quick, the United States are full of life and energy and ready for greater achievements than ever before, but suffering just at this moment because the purchasing power of the rest of the world is so badly reduced that orders are not being received. What does Europe want of the United States under these circumstances? And what reply should we make to her requests? Is it not that she wants what every distressed man wants of his strong and prosperous neighbor? It is not charity to enable her to live in a state of dependence, but aid in recovering economic independence. For if one of two neighbors lives in poverty and distress and the other lives in luxury and does not try to help him who suffers, the happiness and prosperity of each will be diminished.

Two methods of meeting the case and rendering help to the sufferers, are possible. One is to wipe off the debts and let Europe make a new start, so far as we are concerned. The other is to adopt and carry through a wise plan of helpfulness to enable Europe, our customer, to get on her feet and pay her debts as she becomes self-supporting again.

The objections to the first plan may be summed up as follows: (1) It is not scientific. It is no real help to Europe to make her a gift, since in accepting it she would lose that sense of self-reliance which is the basis of good national as well as of good personal character. The individual is better off when he pays his own debts. (2) Assuming that the bonds are to run for 35 years at four and a quarter per cent. interest the ultimate sum paid by our taxpayers would be $23,252,000,000. That is too much burden to assume unless its assumption is inevitable. In this case it is not inevitable. Europe is not bankrupt utterly: she is bankrupt temporarily. There is a way to put her on her feet again, and that way is to accept the second of the two plans just mentioned.

When a business concern falls into temporary disaster, it goes into the hands of a receiver, whose function is to take direction of operations, reduce unnecessary expense, cut off unprofitable features of the business, reform the direction of sales, manufacturing and other departments and generally re-establish the life and energy of the enterprise. While he operates he holds in abeyance, if necessary, the payment of obligations incurred in the past; and to obtain money to carry on the business in its new form he issues certificates of receivership, which have status of preferred obligations over old debts. By this means the receiver is able to relieve the business of its embarassments, if it is fundamentally sound, and to put it in a way to pay off its obligations.

There is every reason to believe that the nations of Europe are today fundamentally sound. They have the working population necessary to resume their ante-bellum operations, they have the plants they once had, except in the districts in which the ravages of war occurred in their worst forms; they have the facility to manufacture developed through long periods of skilful production; and they have the willingness to come back. Their great need, like the need of an embarassed corporation, is capital to tide them over the period of re-organization. If they could be put through some such process as I have indicated the capital could be obtained. It is only necessary to offer as security something more than the general pledge of the governments concerned, since in such case the security is nothing more than the security

behind the general debts of these governments, and that is a security deeply impaired by the weight of debt that the war has produced.

Of course it is difficult to induce the nations of Europe to place themselves into the hands of a receiver. Their instincts are against giving up their full control over their affairs. Certainly, they could not be expected to place themselves in the hands of any other power, however great and good. It is not desired that they place themselves under the supervision of the United States. Nor is it desirable that we should assume any such obligation. Our form of government, our domestic problems, and our national habits are such as to make it inadvisable to set ourselves up as the sole guardians in such a matter.

But it would be a different thing if there were an international commission, in which the nations themselves should have representatives, to take over the functions of adjustment; and in this commission our government could have representation. The plan of the League of Nations looked forward to such a commission. It does not yet appear what is to be the future of the League. But it is not necessary to have the League in order to have the Commission. It is only necessary for the governments to pledge their faith to organize it and carry it through in good faith. It should be endowed with power to tell the nations concerned what they ought to do in order to restore their financial health, to enforce during its existence the necessary economies in public expenditures, and to give direction to the development of national industry in so far as it is necessary to direct it in order to get the best possible results out of it. It is an enterprise that would not involve any of the co-operating states in war, or in any obligations that would lead to war. It would rest solely upon the world's sense of good business, a thing which has never failed the world in the past.

Now the basis of confidence in such a process is the economic interests of the co-operating states and nations. I can think of no party to the plan whose happiness would not demand its success. The merchants of the United States would be interested because it would give solidity to international trade, the financiers because it would remove uncertainty from international investments, the manufacturers because it would enlarge the markets for their products, farmers because it would enable foreign purchasers to take more freely of our food and cotton. The taxpayers of the United States would be deeply interested in it because it is the surest way for them to escape having to assume the payment of the money we have loaned to Europe. Of the people in Europe I can think of none who would be opposed to such a thing except those experimenters who declare that human happiness depends

upon the entire overthrow of the existing form of society. They do not desire the stabilization of society, for their hope is in the spread of discontent and confusion.

Besides the force that a reasonable sense of self-interest would give to the plan, we have the power of our credit as a means of protecting ourselves if worse should come to worse. In any normal condition of trade in the coming years we can expect the balance of trade to be decidedly in our favor. By calling for the interests on the loans we can make it necessary for Europe to send us more than four hundred million dollars a year on that one account. Now outside of the United States the world's production of gold does not exceed in value $305,000,000. If Europe could command all of it—and she cannot do that—she would not be able to send us in money the interest she owes on the debt by $100,000,000. Let us say her available gold supply for export out of increased production in the mines is $250,000,000, which is liberal, she would still have to find $150,000,000 in either gold or products to pay her bill. And to this we must add the interest she will have to pay on the increasing volume of private loans she is contracting in this country. On the other hand, we could use this important power of credit in such a way as to benefit Europe; or, if it became necessary through some unfair conduct on her part, it could be used to force her to do as we wished. If, for example, we called today for the interest due on the loan, it would exhaust the gold reserve of Europe in four years. It would not be necessary to use such power. The mere existence would be enough to warrant that it would not have to be used.

In this discussion I have tried to keep the argument on a purely economic basis; but it has a moral side also. We are in a position to make ourselves liked in Europe as no other nation has been liked there, and being liked as a people will promote our business interests there. It seems inevitable that our capital will have to be loaned freely to put Europe on her feet again; but it makes a deal of difference whether we lend it in a haphazard way, or in accordance with some scheme that commends itself to the business intelligence of the nation. If in the former way uncertainty and irregularity will ensue, and much of the good will and respect that might have been had will be dissipated.

Before Europe the United States stands today as the rich uncle who has been to distant lands, accumulated a vast fortune, and comes back among his impoverished relatives, all of whom are intent on getting some of his money, which they need sorely. He is not a

selfish or mean man and he means to help as he can. In carrying out his purposes he can follow one of three courses. He can hand out his money lavishly, taking no receipts and asking nothing in return, in a truly avuncular way. In that case he will receive many kisses and few thanks. Or he can take the position of the very suspicious man, who doesn't mean to be hoodwinked by persons who profess their love and loyalty. In such a case he will have his money screwed out of him in parcels, some of it going to those who should have it, and some of it going to those whose tongues are most clever. A third course is to take a broad view of the situation, confer in good faith with all who want, get the facts on the situation, lay down on the table as much as he can spare, and hand it out to those who wish and who will use it in such a way as will yield him a safe return while it enables them to proceed in their business in an advantageous manner. For which of these courses have you the proper respect? And for which do you think the beneficiaries will have the greatest gratitude? By following the third the wise uncle will make himself a place in the community. He will be able to write his ideas on its future development and maintain some kind of control on its course.

What does the world want of this rich and fortunate country of ours? Money? Yes, it wants money—not money flung at it in the spirit of a nabob, as one who should say: "Take it! I have plenty!" But money that is the expression of a broad understanding of the world's problems; money that is burnished with intelligence; money that talks because it understands the task it has to do. It needs the help that is an expression of knowledge. That is the only help that is worthy of us, and the only help that will yield us the permanent friendship of the peoples of the world. And if it is given to the world in the way that makes the world respect our leadership, the result will write the word "America" across the history of the twentieth century in letters that shall never fade. It will make for us an influence that is only limited by the capacity of our country to wield it.

Please do not misunderstand me. I do not wish to force the current of events. That is always unwise. But it does not seem too much to urge that the situation actually before the world today be turned over to men who know how to meet it. When the business intelligence of the United States has been trusted it has always proved equal to the demand upon it. Turn over the world's industrial crisis to it. Tell it to obtain first of all the confidence and co-operation of the business

intelligence of the stricken countries. I think it can do that, for it has always been able to do it in the past. Let it, out of this general confidence and co-operation, create the group that is to direct and give authority to the efforts that are to be made. And while the process is going on let us all agree that the people of the United States will give their moral support to the government. Let them also remember to keeps hands off. There must be no throwing of monkey-wrenches. There must for once be a trusting of the experts in the realms of the technical. Whether we shall meet this crisis in some such way as this, or muddle through it according to the instincts of the moment, is the great question of the day. What the world wants of the United States today is business sagacity, breadth of view, and leadership.

Patriotism

By John Erskine, Ph.D., LL.D.
Columbia University

Though we cannot say that the outward circumstances of a man's life are the logical projection of his character, yet we may wish that they were. In so far as we can make the world over, we should like a man's possessions and the scene he occupies to be, as Socrates prayed, in harmony with what he is. But however this harmony may be our desire, it seems to be no concern of the gods; the human lot, if left to itself, continues to fall in curious and unequal places, for the historian to set down, even if he cannot explain them, and for the philosopher to surmount by whatever wings he may command. Only from time to time intelligence looks the hard fact in the face, and some strong will undertakes to bring about in life that order which it cannot find there. Then, at least for that moment, the race approaches the moral climax of civilization, when some man assumes responsibility for the environment in which he has been placed. To make so magnificent an assumption is once more to steal the fire from heaven. The exploit we need not add, is unusual; the Titan is rare. But no other assumption converts the stream of experience into a drama so exciting, so human and so significant, or opens to the imagination a career so bold. In private life, although we cannot measure the extent to which the accidents of birth and nature determine our fortunes, yet without hesitation we distinguish in degree of nobility between him who accepts his fate with resignation, as something that has happened to him, and him who tries first to see in each event some witness to his own progress or his own error in the art of life. Though in this world of infinite changes and chances we are aware how small an area of experience can ever be brought under our control, yet since the area of responsibility is all the field we have for the exercise of character, we give our admiration to the man who would enlarge its boundaries. Not only in private life, but in public affairs as well. There will always be men and women who conceive of government and of society as sections of environment related to them geographically, as it were, but not morally—objects for them to study, to criticize, and possibly to reform. But they whose character is most exalted, and whose imagination embraces the widest arc of experience, perceive that the reform must begin in themselves, for *they* are government, and *they* are society—or if this is not strictly

the fact, they desire it at once to be so. For them patriotism is a human and practical religion, a pursuit of their own ideals in the image of their country, a moral passion urging them to the decisions of intelligence and of conduct, with possibilities of heaven or hell.

What usually goes by the name of patriotism and takes on extraordinary value in time of war, is the natural love of the soil, of the place where we and our people have lived. Unless some abnormal influence pervert us, all men have this love which clings to the world as it is. Yet this kind of patriotism, one of the most beautiful of instincts, is nevertheless an instinct, and needs to be distinguished from that rare moral virtue of which I now speak, which not only regards its environment with pious affection, but assumes responsibility for it, as for the consequences of its own choice. The man who never to himself has said, "This is my own, my native land," is in some sense indeed a dead soul; he lacks that instinctive piety out of which what we may call a moral patriotism can rise. But the majority of mankind, who are frequently conscious of their native land, and who earn thereby the common name of patriots, do not, after all, deserve the exclusive award of the title, nor the excessive praise which poets and orators have lavished upon them. Why should a man be praised for having that which not to have is to be despicable or maimed? What virtue is there in having the usual two hands or two eyes? Or what high place in story should be ours merely for loving the children we beget? Do we suspect our instincts begin to fail, that we should pride ourselves on having one good instinct still in common with other animals? The love of the soil, the love of our own place, like the affection for our young, is planted it seems in every heart that beats at all; it is not so much a grace of life as a condition on which life is tolerable; it is so bound up with the other rooted pieties of our nature, that to separate it, as I wish now to do, from a higher quality, to say that it is only an instinct, and to praise the virtue that rises upon instinct, seems to intend violence, even sacrilege, to a sacred trust. Yet without intending violence or sacrilege, we may properly remind ourselves of some half forgotten claims of the life of reason. At critical moments of history there have been thoughtful enquiries as to which kind of patriotism is truly a virtue, the fidelity to the environment, or the insistence that the environment should be faithful to our character; and twice or thrice great spirits have tried to dedicate even the mass of common men to a moral responsibility for the world about them. Such another critical moment we live through now and we have special need to make the enquiry once more. No single leader has arisen to dedicate us to a

moral patriotism, and none seems likely at this moment to arrive. All the more cause why scholars as a body, and men of thoughtful habits should make available for their fellows the wisdom that the race experience yields. This wisdom, if known, would itself be a kind of leadership, and no other kind, as it seems to me, are we likely to have for some time.

During the war and since the armistice we have listened to voices undeniably great. We have been summoned to sacrifice and to unselfishness, we have had held before us a noble and, however vague, a lasting vision of world peace, and we have been urged—we believe not in vain—to assume responsibility for the conditions of mankind outside our borders. But at the same time, and with an inconsistency not new in human annals, we have had preached at us, and perhaps we ourselves have preached, the desirability of only one kind of patriotism at home, the instinctive kind, which issues in obedience rather than in moral responsibility. We have watched the coming on the American scene of a formidable apparition—the spirit which lays upon the political offender, upon the minority which we hope is mistaken, but which we know is frank, a condemnation more lasting and more severe than upon the weakling who hides himself at the nation's call for aid. A deficiency in the primal instinct to cherish and protect our kindred and the place of one's birth, we have seen treated by a considerable and supposedly solid public opinion, as a not very serious defect, perhaps even a symptom of idealism; whereas a disposition to scrutinize national policy or national conduct, or to sharpen the public conscience to defects in our social or political world, with the intent to remedy them, has come to be thought dangerous as a viper's fangs, not to be argued with but to be stamped on. The spirit which makes this distinction is, I repeat, a formidable apparition, fraught as I think with no good to our national philosophy. It is, for one thing, too much like the spectre of ruthlessness against which we undertook to crusade, and it has aptitudes for teaching us those quick ways of dealing with minorities which we used to consider typical of the older Russian tyranny. Worst of all, the spirit which discourages the rational and moral patriotism, and cultivates only the instinctive and emotional, will raise up a dragon to devour those noble dreams of world unselfishness to which, as I said, we have been called to dedicate ourselves. The love of the soil, so long as it remains only an instinct, has in it no element of concern for anyone else's land. We need not be surprised, therefore, if a nation trained to be patriotic instinctively and uncritically, and in no higher way, subscribes at last to an exclusive nationalism, with indifference, almost with hostility, to other people.

To raise the question at all is to incur risk of misunderstanding. There is the risk of seeming to agree with any political offender who may come to your mind as illustration of the point just made. In suggesting that moral patriotism is more desirable than the merely instinctive kind, we may seem blind to the fact that when an instinct is opposed to an idea it is usually the instinct which prevails; after enough instruction to convince us of the contrary we still have a feeling that the sun goes around the earth. We know further that to intimate the inferiority of the instincts as guides to conduct as over against the reason is a curious folly in an age like ours when both the familiar and popular philosophies have chosen to glorify instinct. But this is an old battle field of intelligence, this opposition of the rational to the merely instinctive life. At the risk of being misunderstood and at the still more certain risk of accomplishing no immediate victory, all of us who have hope for intelligence and would choose the better things of the mind, must cheerfully enlist once more in the oft-defeated cause of reason. Though we know that the humane philosophy of Aristotle, of Christ, and of Aquinas has never yet been widely practised, and that allegiance to it is ceremonial more often than even theoretically sincere, yet for us it is still the best that has been said or thought in the world. And, however vain our championship of it may seem, yet if men will take even a passing interest in an idea, we may perhaps prepare in the public mind a greater susceptibility to those seeds of reason which when they fall only on the instincts, fall on very hard ground indeed. The League of Nations, for example, is an idea, but being an idea, it cannot hope to succeed as the articulation and harmonizing of purely instinctive patriotism. It can become effective only when the patriotisms brought under it are of the same order as itself, rational and moral. There is no reason to hope, nor particularly to wish, that the various patriotisms of the world, even though they should become rational, would be identical or even in much initial harmony with each other, any more than we can expect the rational ideals of the individual to coincide with the ideals of his neighbor. But once we have raised patriotism to the level of reason, we shall have brought it to the sphere of intelligence and responsibility in which light and agreement can conceivably be arrived at.

II

Meanwhile, it is only for the principle of patriotism as moral responsibility that we need to plead. The principle truly needs our championship. There are those in the world still who find no meaning

in life, who give it up as a hard question put to us daily for our irritation without hope of an answer. There are others, the majority among us, who find an answer to the question in obeying our instincts and in submitting to our environment. There are still a few who look for the answer in man himself, in his control of his instincts and his dedication of the environment to his own uses. The majority of us, I repeat, have relegated fate to the world about us; in modern philosophy it is the universe, not the human race, that has the real adventure in morals. A few of us, however, following Greek thought as we believe at its best, would place the throne of fate as much as possible in our own nature, giving to ourselves a divine possibility, the freedom of choice that a god should have, and a responsibility for his actions that not even a god could avoid. As Herodotus and Thucydides wrote history, they explained their wars or their other afflictions as caused by the ambition or the selfishness or the unwise decision of individual men, and for their happiness and prosperity they gave credit not to the environment but to their fellows. When Peisistratus set up his tyranny in Athens, Solon addressed the famous verses to his neighbors:

"If ye have endured sorrow from your own baseness of soul, impute not the fault of this to the gods. Ye have yourselves put the power into the hands of these men."

And when Pericles in his great speech had extolled the city above all other states, he turned the glory into a crown for the dead:

"The Athens I have praised is only what these men have made it."

The difference between this Greek point of view and ours is a difference of philosophy, not, as we often fancy, a difference of knowledge. We need only examine Thucydides or Herodotus to be persuaded how modern were those old historians in their observation of economic or other advantages or handicaps; they saw all that we see. Thucydides tells us that the richest soils are always most subject to a change of masters; he gives as his opinion that Agamemnon was enabled to raise the expedition against Troy more by his superiority in strength than by the oaths of the suitors to follow him; he says that the expedition against Troy was small, not for lack of men but for the difficulty of providing an adequate commissary, and he thinks the Trojans were able to hold out so long only because a large proportion of the Greeks had to cultivate the invaded soil or forage for supplies; he points out the significance of sea power, in peace and in war; he says that the Peloponnesian war was made inevitable by the growth of the Athenian power, and the fear which this inspired in the Lacedaemon. All this sounds modern. But Thucydides does not make up his history out of the environment—out

of economic or any other external conditions; rather, he goes on to tell how Athens decided to protect the Corcyrans against the Corinthians, and how this decision started the war; how the Spartans massacred the Plataeans, and how the Athenians exterminated the inhabitants of Melos, and the moral results of those actions; and how at last through evil choices the power of Athens was destroyed. He hoped, he said, that his record might be prized not as a romantic chronicle of events, but as a storehouse of human wisdom, that it might be judged useful by those inquirers who desire an exact knowledge of the past as an aid to the interpretation of the future. With this purpose, he treats the Peloponnesian war as a series of decisions which the combatants had to make, and the battles and other events follow as the divine commentary on the decisions. He introduces the account of conduct in each instance with an elaborate report of the debate of which that conduct was the event, and we hardly needed his hint to observe that the speeches as he gives them were probably never made, but are his statements, rather, of the various points of view which converged on that issue. His interpretation of history, therefore, is neighbor to Plato's method in philosophy, a dramatizing of moral ideas, for the better observation of their implications.

Much as we may admire this high-mindedness in Thucydides, who has been a long time dead, I confess I cannot perceive a tendency in living historians to imitate it, nor in the rest of us to desire it of historians now writing. Explain the fall of a great power as the moral consequence of its decisions! A British historian might so narrate the collapse of Germany, but would a German historian so narrate it? Or would an English or American historian tell the story with such a conviction of moral responsibility, if it were Great Britain or the United States that had come to disaster? And if he did, what would we do to him? But Thucydides was an Athenian. Writing of his own city and of his own day, he refused to remove from man the dignity of moral choices; he persisted in the faith that the good and the bad of life are not causes, but rather things to choose between. The extremes of Aristotelian temperance, the earthly and the heavenly steeds in Plato's vision, were to come under the control of intelligence. Because of this locating of fate in human conduct, this enshrining of the god in the heart of man, the Greek philosophy once seemed humane, and the monuments of the Greek spirit were called the humanities. We have kept the word but have somewhat lost the old meaning. The humane person was one who understood his responsibility for his own moral career; with us the humane person is one who by his benefactions becomes as it were the moral system of his neighbor. Our kind of humaneness Herodotus noticed from time to

time in the character of a Persian tyrant, but we must search long for it in portrait of a Greek, who thought it a greater benefit to increase the freedom of a man's moral choice than to protect him from the choice altogether. Says Pericles:

"The freedom which we enjoy in our government extends also to our ordinary life. There, far from exercising a jealous surveillance over each other, we do not feel called upon to be angry with our neighbor for doing what he likes. Yet we obey the laws, not only the written, but also those which, though unwritten, cannot be broken without dishonor."

Not all the hearers of Pericles understood his high philosophy, of that we may be sure. Doubtless many of those dead whom his oration immortalized had fought for their portion of Attic soil instinctively, with a quite simple clinging to their hearth, and with no more complex patriotism. When the Peloponnesians began to invade the country, it was by the advice of Pericles that the country folk had removed to the city their wives and children, their household furniture, even in some cases the woodwork of their houses. Thucydides says they found it hard to move, since most of them had always lived in the country. They were pagans in the old and profound sense, rooted to the earth by immemorial pieties; the soil they worked in was one with the dust of their fathers. They were mindful too, of a legendary independence, of the self-sufficient dignity of each minute village in the days before Theseus made Athens a political center. From such households there must have been many recruits in the Athenian army who fought not exactly because they had made an Aristotelian choice, but because it was unthinkable not to defend the family hearth and the family tombs. Just who the invader was, made no difference—Xerxes but yesterday, Archidamus today. The relatives of such men, listening to Pericles, may indeed have felt in some dim way the difference between instinctive patriotism and that vaster loyalty, moral and to their minds impersonal, of which the political orator spoke; but they probably preferred the loyalty of instinct.

It is just because the audience may not have agreed with Pericles in his immortal oration that we may turn to it now for light. On what subject did they disagree? We are often reminded nowadays that Pericles was seizing a dramatic occasion to glorify Athens and the cause of which he was the leader. On what ground did he glorify Athens? He represented it as a state for which the citizen was morally responsible; and if some of his hearers disagreed, it was because they doubted their share in this responsibility, or in their hearts may have declined to accept it. The grandeur of the oration is in the attempt to dedicate a whole people to a moral instead of an instinctive philosophy—grandeur

no whit lessened by the reluctance of the people to be so dedicated. The entire ceremony of which the oration was a part, had for its purpose to enlarge the tribal loyalty to the dimensions of a national ideal, and gently to bring away the ancestral religion from merely local shrines, and attach it to a place of common and intertribal memories. In the funeral procession, says Thucydides[1], cypress coffins were borne in cars, one for each tribe, the bones of the dead being placed in the coffin of their tribe. So much concession at least, to a natural and instinctive patriotism. Among these coffins was carried one empty bier, decked for the missing—that is, for those whose bodies could not be recovered. Finally, the dead were laid, not in their ancestral burying grounds, in the ancient villages they had perished to defend, but in the public sepulchre, in the suburb of the city called Beautiful, where they who fell in war were always buried, with the exception of those slain at Marathon, who for their extraordinary valor were interred on the spot where they fell. It was over the new graves in the military cemetery that Pericles spoke, before mourning relatives who perhaps would have preferred to bury the dead sons or husbands nearer their ancestors—as some of us, with the same instinct, would bring them home from France; so much more comforting is it, in spite of all we profess as to matter and spirit, that they should be covered with familiar dust than that they should rest in an idea.

Before such hearers Pericles made his great plea for intelligent patriotism:

"What was the path by which we reached our eminence?" [he asked.] "What was the form of government under which we became great? Out of what national habits did our greatness spring?"

Our institutions are free, he continued; advancement in public life goes by merit, and liberty in private life is without lawlessness. We have leisure for the mind, and we welcome the stranger within the city. But most of all we are morally responsible, and we cultivate reason. We place the disgrace of poverty not in owning to the fact but in declining to struggle against it. Instead of regarding discussion as a hindrance to action, we think it an indispensible preliminary to any wise action at all. In our enterprises we both dare and deliberate, and we give the palm of courage to those who best know the difference between hardship and pleasure, and yet are never tempted to shrink from danger.

"The Athens I have praised," [he concludes,] "is only what these men and their like have made her. For this offering of their lives, made in common by them all, they have each received that renown which never grows old

(1) The following passages are paraphrased and adapted from the translation by Crawley.

and for a sepulchre, not so much that in which their bones are placed, but that noblest of shrines wherein their glory is laid up to be eternally remembered. For the grave of great men is the whole world. In lands far from their own, far from the funeral shaft and the epitaph, there is also a wider record of them, written in the human heart."

Those hearers who were reluctant to leave their dead in the national cemetery must have known that the last great phrases were directed particularly at them. They probably felt that Pericles was going quite too far when he threw overboard altogether the genius of locality, and said that the grave of great men is the whole world. But they had one tradition even in their tribal pieties, which may have helped them to understand better than we do his doctrine of moral responsibility in patriotism. They may not have followed him in the argument that man's concern is with the moral world; that he must take sides in moral questions; that the crisis of the state is simply his problem in morality on its largest scale; that the state is his creation, his poetry, the last incarnation of his ideal life, which should sum up all his other arts. But every one of them, of whatever tribe, would recall in his own history the legend of those who had founded states—Theseus and Solon, and innumerable other heroes from mythical time. Some of the states founded turned out well, he would recall; others were bad. In either case the legend explained the result by the character of the founder. He would think of these pioneers as we think of the pilgrim fathers, for whom the creation of government was not an end; but the Greek who listened to Pericles would also feel, as we sometimes do not, even when we think of the pilgrim fathers, that no state is established once for all, that no settlers are the exclusive pioneers, that no citizen, therefore, is excused from exercising the duty and the right to found the state again in his own moral choices. Athens had learned early to condemn all neutrals in public affairs. Plutarch reminds us of Solon's law that whenever a rebellion or sedition occurred, those who had not taken a definite stand on one side or the other should be disfranchised. With these principles in mind, the philosophers taught that all education should have for its end intelligent and moral citizenship, and that the difference between tyranny and democracy is that the tyrant has the moral responsibility for the state which he alone creates, whereas in a democracy all the citizens share the continuous founding, and all are responsible for it. The Athenians from the outer villages may have been restive under the far-reaching phrases of Pericles, but if they reflected at length on the doctrine, they would recall that the heroes of their antiquity had practised that virtue for which the great statesman was now speaking.

III

The wish to dedicate Athenian patriotism to a moral career, to raise it up to the region of ideas, in which conscious responsibility is possible, is found in other Greeks than Pericles—in Socrates, in Plato, in Aristotle, and in the orators; and if our modern interpretations are not altogether mistaken, it is the inspiration of most of the dramas Euripides composed. If we look at life fairly, with due allowance for all its difficulties and for the immense pressure in the daily routine that holds us, by a spiritual gravitation, to leaden-footed contact with familiar paths, it is not surprising that none of these prophets was permanently listened to, or that Socrates and Euripides, the most outspoken, were condemned by public opinion. A similar fate has attended others in later centuries, who with the same loftiness of spirit tried to translate into terms of reason the passion for their city or for their land. Dante hoped so to consecrate loyalty to Florence and loyalty to Rome. He dreamt of a two-fold city of God and earth, the Church and the Empire, both implanted by divine love in the midstream of history, that through both at once man might enjoy here the moral career without which no soul can be disciplined for heaven. That he wrote of monarchy and thought in terms of the empire is of little consequence in comparison with the fact that his ideal state was to be a moral opportunity, and that in his definitions of it he lays down a program for intelligence. Others might love their native Florence for other reasons, or with very differennt purposes might speculate as to the reform of church and state, but this is the old and rare philosophy—how familiar in the periods Thucydides and of Aristotle; how very unfamiliar still in the actual patriotisms history records! In politics as in science, he begins[1], we must do for posterity what our ancestors did for us; we must be ourselves in turn ancestors. For simply to be loyal to the past is to bring the past to an end, as the talent was buried in the napkin. We do not value a tree for last season's fruit. What fruit would you bear by demonstrating once more some theorem of Euclid? Who, after Aristotle, need expound the nature of felicity? Or who, after Cicero, need undertake the apology of old age?

He continues by expounding his new fruits in very old terms, yet they keep forever a kind of novelty, since the race has but seldom attended to them, least of all, perhaps, in the very times and places where they have been learned by rote. The poet was aware that his contemporaries would in one way recognize the Aristotelian echoes, but in quite

[1] *De Monarchia*, paraphrased and adapted from Wickstead's translation.

another sense he hoped that these great definitions, these essential manoeuvres of the mind, might come like revelation to men sunk in passions and instincts. There are some things, he proceeds, in no degree subject to our power; they are for our thought and contemplation. Other things, however, *are* subject to our power; we can think about them and do them. In the case of these, which compose the world of our moral responsibility, the doing is not undertaken for the sake of thinking, but the thinking for the sake of doing. The whole field of politics is eminently a part of this moral world, in which intelligence should precede conduct. For (passing over the special arguments for monarchy) the human race is best disposed when most free. This will be clear if the principle of freedom be understood. The first principle of freedom is freedom of choice, which many have on their lips but few in their understanding. They get as far as saying that free choice is free judgment in matters of will; and herein they say the truth, but the import of the words is far from them. What is judgment? Judgment is the link between apprehension and appetite. For first a thing is apprehended, then when apprehended it is judged to be good or bad, and finally he who has so judged it pursues or shuns it.

With this simple capitulation of old principles Dante embarks on his demonstration of God's will as to the empire and the church. By the same principles in his great poem he judges the politicians of Florence, friend and foe, and assigns to them with fervent rigor their place in hell or purgatory, and by the same principles he judges his own failure to deserve the salutation of Beatrice. One who has moved in the true order of reason, in which judgment controls appetite or instinct, and who yet condescends to a lower order, in which appetite or instinct controls judgment, has abdicated his high station, a little lower than the angels, and has joined the beasts. For he has surrendered his freedom, as the patriot surrenders liberty when his patriotism becomes only instinctive. If the judgment is moved by the appetite, which to some extent anticipates it, it cannot be free, for it does not move of itself, but is drawn captive by another. And hence it is that brutes cannot have free judgment, because their judgments are always anticipated by appetite.

If we may speak of appetite and instincts interchangeably, then these axioms and definitions allow no room among the virtues for that kind of loyalty to city or state which is instinctive. The natural love for one's birthplace or for one's habitat is a force which judgment or reason should guide; it cannot be an ideal in itself. It is for this doctrine of freedom that Dante stands in the race memory with Pericles and the few other great statesmen who have seen the moral aspect of patriotism. If

you protest that Dante used his axioms and definitions as a base on which to set up a defence of monarchy, I reply that Milton, a patriot of an equally reasoned morality, used much the same axioms and definitions to defend the idea of popular government; in either case, the political program they chose is far less important than the fact that the choice was rational. If you object again that such diversity of result is inconvenient or deplorable, and that a kind of patriotism which permits diametrically opposed conclusions cannot be sound, I must reply that this criticism can be brought against any system of morality which specifies freedom of judgment as one of its principles. The desire for unanimity is a deep-rooted instinct, which leads speedily to confusion wherever two or three are gathered together, for unless the ideal of free judgment tempers somewhat the demand for harmony, our instincts persuade us that those who disagree with us are evil. If you allow as much , so far as the individual is concerned, yet believe that the general good is best served when the citizens do not distract each other by various ideals, however rational, of the state they yield allegiance to, but simply and with single devotion love that state as it is, I reply that such a program of instinctive patriotism would produce harmony in the United States, in Great Britain and in Japan, let us say, and war among all three. The grace to understand and to sympathize with the stranger within or without our gates comes not by instinct but by the discipline of reason. It was a mistake for Dante to argue for unity of decision in the moral world; he then had to argue for one empire and only one. Milton, likewise, had he pressed his political applications far enough, would perhaps have deserted the principle of moral liberty and reached a Puritan intolerance. Pericles in the midst of his great vision was pleading for Athenian supremacy. This is to say that all three were to some extent caught in a natural instinct. But to all of them it would have seemed intelligent to use Wordsworth's image of the nobler allegiance; he felt for England, he said, as the mother for her child. The love of the mother for her child, not the love of the child for its mother. If our country is only our mother, we owe it reverence and gratitude, but it is too late to control its career, If it is our child, however, we are responsible for it.

IV

I offer ancient examples of a constant problem. In a world shared by both instinct and reason, the wise man will desire both in their strength even though it is hard to reconcile them. The stronger the instinct, the harder to control it; the instinct which begets love in us for our country will sooner or later. if uncontrolled, beget hate in us for other countries;

yet if the instinct is not strong, what energy is there to control? In the United States we have become detached from the soil; we have moved about from place to place, we have almost forgotten, some of us, what the household hearth looks like; no wonder that the instinctive loyalty which defends particular places and neighborhoods has seemed to fail within us; no wonder that we have tried to fan it into new flame. I believe we shall succeed in rousing such fervent gratitude in the average American heart for the fact that he is an American, and such unquestioning devotion to the land as it is, that unless we quickly bring our impulses under the control of moral judgment, we may become a menace to the earth. That way to madness is easier than we may think. To follow such a course is not only to withdraw within our appetite, as Dante would say, but it is also to leave the weapons of reason entirely in the hands of the crank, the agitator, and the radical, who whatever else may be their ignorance, understand the force of the old doctrine, that who most avail themselves of reason shall have the greatest power. The ideal state which the radical portrays seems to some of us an abomination. It has, however, the one great virtue of being an ideal, for which the agitator not infrequently goes to jail. We meet his ideals chiefly with our instincts. It is a natural instinct to build the jail and put him in it. But is there no ideal America to oppose to his, no ideal more soundly imagined, which reason might successfully urge upon him? Are we less than he the children of Plato, dreamers of ideal states and builders of just republics? If that is true, if we have surrendered to others the exclusive use of rational processes, then for us the monuments of literture and history have lost their meaning; the ages have stored up wisdom in vain.

But not in vain, we believe. The country our fathers bequeathed to us is too precious to be interred in any of our instincts, not even in the noblest. Too many dreams have voyaged to our shores for us to let go the habit of vision. And the patriotism which still dreams, has in it promise of the highest morality. We shall be as a guard set about the established city. We shall earn the right also to say with the Athenian envoys thousands of years ago, "We risked all for a city that existed only in hope.."

William Richardson Davie and Federalism

By H. M. Wagstaff
University of North Carolina

Just a round century ago William Richardson Davie died upon his estate in South Carolina. It is fitting that the Literary and Historical Society of North Carolina, the state to which he gave his greatest service and which has every right to claim him as her own, should at this time assess the value of his contribution to her life.

Davie was born, 1756, in Egremont, Cumberlandshire, England. At seven years of age he was brought to South Carolina and adopted by his maternal uncle, William Richardson, a Presbyterian minister who owned an estate in the Waxhaw settlement on the Catawba. His preliminary education was at the hands of his uncle, then a period at Queen's Academy, Charlotte, North Carolina. He then entered Nassau Hall, Princeton, and received his arts degree at the hands of Dr. John Witherspoon in 1776, having employed his preceding vacation as a volunteer in the American army in its unsuccessful defense of New York against the British. With this youthful taste of military service, and upon the death of his uncle almost coincident with his graduation, Davie returned to South Carolina and almost immediately thereafter entered upon the study of law at Salisbury in North Carolina. In the following year he interrupted his studies to join a military force under General Allen Jones which was moving southward to aid in the defense of Charleston. In 1779 he became lieutenant of dragoons raised in the Salisbury District, was attached to Pulaski's Legion, and integrated with General Lincoln's army of the South. In the fighting about Charleston he was severely wounded. During his tedious recovery he resumed his law studies at Salisbury and received his license in the spring of 1780. The rising tide of British success in the state to the south called him again to arms in the same year. He was now in continuous service to the close of the war and emerged from the conflict with a reputation for military skill and daring second to no partisan leader in the South. After peace Colonel Davie married Sarah Jones, of Halifax, eldest daughter of General Allen Jones, his old military commander. He settled in Halifax for the practice of law and swiftly made a high place for himself in his chosen profession.

Davie's political activities form an intimate chapter of the state's history for the next twenty years. His political views, however, would

have scant meaning to present time unless projected upon the background of our early republican era. The North Carolina of the first two decades after the Revolution held in solution the elements which, though slow in precipitation, were ultimately to shape her present character. Social democracy was more nearly a reality in North Carolina than in either her neighbor to the north or to the south. This had been dictated by economic conditions less sharply marking the rich from the poor. State individualism, infused with the spirit of democracy, was the primary characteristic with which the state had emerged from the struggle for independence. This characteristic as a force now found political expression in a studied disregard of obligations to the Confederation government, in continued harrying of Tories, in new issues of paper money, in the prolongation of vicious "stay laws," and in extreme decentralization of state authority. It represented the tentative groping of the democratic spirit unchastened by experience. The theory of the French Revolution was already born in America before 1789.

It has always seemed to me that the American Revolution was produced by two distinct sets of forces, emanating from two different groups of men. Of the first were the reasoned out opinion of intelligent and educated Americans that they were the equals of Englishmen at home, equal in all their rights and in all their capacities for self-government. They were humiliated that England sent officials to America instead of choosing officials in America. It was natural that these sensitive and high-spirited colonial-Englishmen should capitalize the blunders of George III's place-men. The other set of forces was born of the mass and was the product of frontier environment acting upon a naturally independent and individualistic race. It may be summed up as the spirit of democracy, a thing impatient of restraints, even of those laid by itself. Ultimately this spirit was to more sharply characterize America in contrast to Europe than even its devotion to the theory of self-government.

This influence affected the mass mind and therefore the larger group of Americans. Davie and most of the educated men in North Carolina, as indeed in America, belonged to the first group. Independence being won they were now more interested in an orderly reconstruction of the political and economic edifice than in a politico-social rebirth of the country. This was an immediate and pressing need if the fruits of victory were to be enjoyed. Not only was there imperative demand for practical attention to after-the-war weaknesses

of the individual state, but to the bond of union between the states, which indeed had proved barely strong enough to carry them through their common danger.

Hence to informed and practical men like Davie first attention after the Revolution was due to the wounds made by the war; then to putting the new state government in harmony with sound political practice—practice approved by sound political precedent; and, thirdly, to strengthening the bond between the states.

But the state had emerged from the Revolution under the control of the popular or democratic party, the party swayed by popular passion and inclined to illustrate sharp contrasts with the past. At the same time this party was characterized by an intense consciousness of the state's individual sovereignty and an extreme disinterest in the common government, the Confederacy. This somewhat blatant democracy embodied in its membership most of the soldiers of the Revolution, many of their officers, the bulk of the state officials, and the mass of what Archibald Maclaine was fond of calling "the common people."

On the other hand the conservatives made up so small a minority that they may best be described as a coterie of educated men, mainly lawyers, who were well fitted for leadership and likely to acquire influence and power as soon as the passions of the recent conflict began to cool. Among the best known names in this group were Samuel Johnston, Benjamin Hawkins, Richard Dobbs Spaight, James Iredell, Archibald Maclaine, John Steele, and William R. Davie. But in the years immediately succeeding independence they were able only to exercise a moderating and restraining influence in state affairs. Most of them found places in the legislature and there, by sheer virtue of talent, often turned the majority aside from ultra-radical action. Their opportunity for control, however, was continually delayed. It promised to appear when, in 1786, it was proposed to strengthen the union by amending the articles of Confederation. This proposal found ready acceptance by them in that they had consistently held that the welfare of North Carolina was indissolubly linked with her sister states. It would, if achieved, bring about national and international respectability, a result that independence did not alone assure. Moreover it would doubtless correct various evils from which the country at large or the states individually suffered. Lastly, to the conservative the movement seemed to promise an opportunity for public service and public honors, in state and nation, to those who advanced it.

Interested alike in all these results the conservatives threw themselves with zeal and skill into the work of creating sentiment for amend-

ment of the articles. Davie, who had enjoyed a continuous service in the lower house as borough member from Halifax, had insisted upon and procured the appointment of delegates to the Annapolis Convention in 1786. In 1787 he was equally insistent upon a commission to Philadelphia. This the majority granted, though apparently out of deference to the invitation and the urging of the conservatives. The preamble of the act of appointment embodied the sentiments of the conservatives and bore the unmistakable stamp of Davie.

Nevertheless three of the commission, as elected, were of the dominant democracy, Willie Jones, the unrivaled leader of his party, among them. Jones was a particularist of extreme type, who, long in control of the majority party, had confirmed it in the view that North Carolina was its chief and practically only concern. Though he did not oppose sending delegates to Philadelphia, political consistency bade him refuse the appointment. Richard Caswell, the governor, burdened with heavy responsibilities at home, also declined, and being empowered by law to fill the vacancies, named two friends of the movement, in which his own sympathies were strongly enlisted. Hence the delegation as finally made up consisted of one democrat, Alexander Martin, and four conservatives, William R. Davie, Richard Spaight, Hugh Williamson, and William Blount.

Of Davie's activity in the Philadelphia Convention we have, of course, no complete record, but sufficient to show that his weight was thrown on the side of the large state-group which proposed that representation in the national legislature should be on the basis of population instead of an equality among the states. Nevertheless he came to indorse the compromise of equality in the senate and proportional representation in the house. Further, he strongly opposed counting out the slave population of the South in making up federal numbers, and finally put the convention on notice that the South would not federate unless at least three-fifths of the slaves were counted.

Davie returned to North Carolina to meet pressing engagements just before the convention adjourned. Nevertheless he lost no time in marshaling the sentiment of the other North Carolina conservatives for the new document. These now became an active working corps for its adoption, while the democrats looked on interested but questioning.

Even before the convention at Philadelphia had finished its labors the most far-sighted of the conservatives began to plan the election of a state governor in harmony with their views on the matter of ratification. They now began to call themselves federal men, and soon there-

after, Federalists. By assiduous correspondence and personal exertions practical organization was effected, the old conservatives to a man rallying to the new and fortunate issue. Control of the legislature must be the first objective, since the legislature elected the governor, and would be called upon to grant a state convention to pass upon the new constitution. Every prominent conservative in the state became a candidate for one or the other branches of the legislature. Intense interest was awakened as the fight became fast and furious, and much bitterness was engendered in many localities. The federal leaders took as their common theme the weakness of the old Confederation and, its corollary, the need of a firmer principle of union. Nevertheless it was clear, as the campaign developed, that they were forcing the fighting on the new ground as a means of gaining state supremacy, while the democrats, thrown upon the defensive, were struggling not so much to assure rejection of the constitution in advance as to maintain their control. Nor, despite the campaign declaration of the federal men, did democratic victory imply that the new frame of government, when submitted, would not be accorded due consideration.

The campaign was of considerable educative value and accentuated interest in larger affairs than the average North Carolinian had been wont to concern himself. Though the federalists had made a notable effort, and had attracted numerous recruits to their ranks, they failed to wrest control from the party in power. The democrats were easily able to organize both branches of the assembly when the body convened. Archibald Maclaine, beaten in New Hanover, had to solace himself with the reflection that 'the asembly contained *some* men of sense who would endeavor to do what was necessary.' Davie had easily secured his seat and appeared in the lower house as the ranking federalist member. Just from the scene of the constitution making at Philadelphia he was prepared to exercise an even greater influence than usual upon the actions of the assembly.

Now occurred in the legislature a most interesting inconsistency in political history. The democrats, after a most heated campaign, and now in full control of both branches, for the nonce held partisanship in abeyance, and on joint ballot chose Samuel Johnston governor despite his known opposition to the bulk of principles for which the majority stood. The explanation lies in Johnston's character, in Davie's political generalship, and in the nature of the questions which now confronted the state. Johnston was perhaps the best known federalist in North Carolina. As a most influential member in the revolutionary Provincial Council he was a potent force in the government of North

Carolina between the abdication of Josiah Martin, the last royal governor, and the accession of Richard Caswell under the state constitution. He served the state wisely and well during this critical period and would undoubtedly have become the first governor under the constitution had not Caswell's military achievements suddenly brought the latter into prominence as a desirable war-time executive. Though trusted by the whole state for his wisdom, probity, and patriotism Johnston was well known to be far from democratic either in personal practice or political theory. This explains his exclusion from political preferment since the Revolution, save three years in the Congress of the Confederation. Equally conversant with State and confederation affairs he was regarded as the man of ripest mind in the State. The democracy, confronted now with the necessity, even against its will, of fixing attention on Confederation affairs, began to have a sense of need of Johnston's wisdom.

With the executive office accorded to Johnston by grace, the democratic majority, also by grace, ordered the election of a state convention to consider the new plan of government which had been evolved by the Philadelphia Convention. The election of this convention aroused even greater popular interest than had that of the preceding assembly. Davie and James Iredell led the federalistic forces, the former clearly demonstrating the fact that he was the most eloquent constitutional advocate in the State. Together the two, at their own expense, issued a pamphlet in analysis of the constitution that takes rank with the ablest of the "Federalist Papers" of Madison, Jay, and Hamilton.

The election of convention delegates resulted in the choice of the ablest men of both parties, this being made possible by the fact of the old English practice that any freeholder might be chosen by any county or borough town whether he was a resident of the same or of some other. Too, there was an appreciation of ability and character very generally prevalent in North Carolina during the first four decades after independence, that made it possible and not infrequent for a constituency to confer public honors out of deference to those qualities, even though the recipient's political views may not have accorded with those of the electors so honoring him.

When the balloting had closed it was soon ascertained that the federalists had secured only a respectable minority of the seats in the convention. Nevertheless their leaders continued to hope that when the body met it would ratify. In this they relied upon the weight of the ten states that had already ratified. This was one more than was sufficient to secure the new union and the abandonment of the old Confederation. And among the ten was Virginia, whose influence was especially potent

in the Roanoke and Albemarle regions of North Carolina, regions which at that time were the most populous, the wealthiest, and therefore the most influential portion of the state. Davie wrote from Halifax in June: "The decision of Virginia has altered the tone of the Antis here very much." But, he further states: "Mr. Jones says his object will now be to get the constitution rejected in order to give weight to the proposed amendments, and talks in high commendation of those made by Virginia."

When the convention met, July 21, Jones proved to be firm in this purpose. He had kept his party's front quite unbroken, and so adroit was his one-man-leadership that he was in position to absolutely dictate the action of the convention. Nevertheless Governor Johnson, out of deference to his office and public character, was chosen by unanimous vote to preside. Davie and James Iredell bore the chief responsibility for advocacy of ratification. There was not a peer of either of them in the opposition camp. Virtual admission of this by the democrats was shown in their declination to enter into debate. They were content to leave the issue to the test of ballots rather than arguments. Thus for some days the federalist leaders stood forth to analyze the constitution, to show the benefits to accrue from its operation, and to point out the ills of the old order. Sensing the chief ground of fear of the democrats to be an over-strong central authority Davie continually emphasized the point that the new constitution was, in nature, a compact between the states, and the government to be set up under it, their agent. Spaight also reiterated this view. Nor does their theory seem to have been assumed to lull the suspicions of the opposition. Both had been members of the Philadelphia Convention and presumably knew the spirit in which the document was drawn.

Non-adoption, however, was predetermined. Jones finally embodied this decision in a resolution which likewise asserted the necessity for a bill of rights and suggested the call of a second federal convention. To the resolution was appended a declaration of rights similar to that in the state constitution, together with a list of twenty-six amendments very similar to those suggested by Virginia. The resolution was carried by a vote of 184 to 84 and a motion by a federalist to substitute a ratifying resolution was defeated by the same vote reversed; upon which the convention adjourned. New York ratified soon after, thus leaving only North Carolina and Rhode Island outside the federal pale.

Public opinion now began to veer around. Even the redoubtable Willie Jones weakened in his stand, as appears from his disinterest in the succeeding assembly elections. Nor did Davie appear in the

November assembly, but remained outside struggling to create sentiment to force a new convention from it. This result was achieved, but the democrats were able to defer its meeting until six months after the new federal government had been organized.

Davie was a member of this second convention and the proponent of the motion which ratified the constitution, November 21, 1789, thus bringing to a successful conclusion the issue in which his sympathies were so ardently enlisted.

By virtue of his service to the federalist cause Davie was now logically in line for federal honors, either at the hands of the people or by federal appointment. But in keeping with his ideas of disinterested service he put aside the urging of his friends to stand for a seat in congress, as well as the offer of a district judgeship by President Washington, and turned with redoubled energy to the task of stimulating North Carolinians to a more progressive citizenship. In this he, almost alone among North Carolinians of his time, sensed the fundamental need of the inchoate democracy rising in America. In the new Republic, the new state, and the new order of society which they portended, he realized before other men of the South that the quality of the mass intelligence must be raised. This only would assure a fitting use of the great opportunities which lay ahead.

The state legislature became his fulcrum, and during the next decade, and despite opposition party control, he prodded it toward the goal he had in mind. Thus he wrested from a reluctant legislature the creation of the State University. Then by personal supervision he saw to its erection, its opening, and guided its early years of operation. At the same time he was the chief patron and advocate of the few academies in the State. He procured the statute under which the state laws were revised and brought into intelligent co-ordination. It was through his activity largely that the state was brought to cede its western area to the federal government. He headed three successive commissions to settle boundary disputes with neighbor states. He sought earnestly to commit the state to a system of internal improvements. He found time from his ever-growing law practice to set an example upon his own estate at Halifax of the most advanced agricultural methods.

In matters affecting the federal union during this decade Davie was keenly sensitive to every influence that threatened to weaken its stability. It was this fear for the union that led him to regard Hamilton's assumption measures as too strong for the infant resources of the republic. It was the same influence that caused his endorsement of Justice Iredell's state-rights view in the Chisholm-Georgia case in 1794, an opinion

which the most orthodox Federalist ultimately conceded to be sound. This opinion was soon thereafter embodied in the eleventh amendment to the constitution, thus precluding the possibility of a citizen suing a state. On the Jay Treaty Controversy in 1795 Davie was more interested in the safety of the federal principle than in the nature of the treaty.

"The present Crisis," he writes to Justice Iredell, "appears to me to be the most delicate and important since the organization of the government. The Anti-federalists and the personal enemies of the administration have rallied with astonishing rapidity . . . . I believe they will now make their last effort to shake the government."

Federalism as a set of party principles failed to develop strength in North Carolina during this decade, nor had Davie made this a chief concern in any of his tasks. The state remained under the control of the democracy, now beginning to call itself the Republican party and recognizing Jefferson as its national chief. It remained to be seen what would be the result, both upon state politics and upon Davie, should circumstances arise to threaten the principle of union to a graver degree than any heretofore.

This threat came in 1798 when the country was on the eve of war with France over the "X. Y. Z." incident and accumulated grievances. The Republican party, under Jefferson's inspiration, eagerly seized upon the Federalist measures, the Alien and Sedition Acts, as grounds for a strong partisan offensive against the administration of John Adams. The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions were the weapons of attack. To Davie they seemed utterly subversive of the principle of union and served as a sharp challenge to him and other North Carolina Federalists to win state control. Thus they would assure its support of the national honor in war and the integrity of the union in peace. To this end they were aided by the swiftly rising tide of national patriotism before an external danger. Davie and his lieutenants conducted an intensive campaign for mastery in the legislature. They secured a strong predominance in the senate and likewise a majority, though a small and waning one in the lower house. Davie was elected governor on joint ballot, being at the same time member of the lower house, though devoting most of his time to preparation of the state troops for war—for which purpose he had been appointed by President Adams a brigadier-general. He was to take his seat as governor on January 1, 1799.

In the meantime the then Republican Governor, Samuel Ashe, submitted the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions to the assembly in defer-

ence to the requests of the governors of those states. They were treated with great contempt by the senate; but the lower house passed a resolve to instruct the state's senators and request its representatives to move in congress for repeal of the Alien and Sedition Acts. This resolve the senate rejected by the decisive vote of 31 to 8. The lower house, by a scant majority, was convinced that repeal was the way out and in the bitterness aroused between the two houses over the "instruction question" cooperation on other questions was no longer possible. Hence when Davie was inaugurated he found a legislative deadlock on every Federalist measure. A bill to transfer the choice of presidential electors from the people to the legislature was firmly rejected by the lower house, even though the governor's whole strength was exerted in its support. Davie seems to have regarded this measure not as a party expedient in anticipation of continued Federalist control of the legislature, but as a wise and just protection against popular passion and over-hasty judgment.

Davie, in his official and private capacity alike, held the threat of disunion contained in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions to be a graver danger than the war with France and so wrote Iredell in June, 1799. But his party's position was based on the war scare, and when Adams suddenly veered round and appointed a second commission to France he sealed the doom of Federalism in North Carolina as well as in the nation. The President tendered Davie an appointment on the Commission after a declination by Patrick Henry, but in his acceptance Davie suffered no illusions as to its wisdom or its chances for success. Just before sailing he wrote Iredell, "The appointment of Envoy is highly honorable to me and, under any other circumstances would have been certainly agreeable; but the unknown and ever-varying situation of the Government to which we are accredited, its strange, unparalleled character and unsettled policy, furnish no data upon which we can calculate the issue of our mission, and must cast the reputation of those concerned in it entirely upon chance." The mission, together with the First Consul's temporary change of French policy toward America, averted war, but at the price of disruption of the Federalist party.

In North Carolina it removed Davie from the governorship at the most critical moment in Federalist fortunes. We was now by far the most influential Federalist in the state and had he remained at his post would doubtless have been retained for the constitutional three consecutive terms. But upon his acceptance of the French mission his followers fell into panic and the Republicans of the lower house were able on joint ballot to force the election of a Republican successor.

Davie returned in January, 1801, to find his party shattered in state and nation and a contested election between Jefferson and Burr in the House of Representatives. To John Steele he wrote, February 2, 1801:

"The Federalists (i. e. in North Carolina) own the destruction of the constitution as an event almost certain under the administration of Mr. Jefferson; and as to the administration of Mr. Burr, although it may be energetic, *no man* knows what course it may take. I have been visited by a great number of the most influential and enlightened friends of government in this part of the country since my return and they all express insuperable repugnance to the election of Burr, urging his want of character, etc."

When the contest had been decided in Jefferson's favor and the Republican administration launched, Davie took the lead in North Carolina in an effort to rehabilitate his party's fortunes. Under his guidance a newspaper, the "Minerva" was set up at Raleigh to serve as the party organ. Its end was to be

"the noble object of suppressing falsehood and disseminating truth, of subverting the wild and visionary projects and opinions of Democracy and advocating in their place sound, substantial, and practical principles of Federalism."

In 1803, at the earnest solicitation of his party men, he reluctantly stood for the seat of his district in congress. Finding many of the moderate Republicans in his support, and fearing misundertanding on their part, Davie issued a circular that they might know what to expect of him. It ran:

"I desire that it may be clearly understood that I never have and that I never will surrender my principles to the opinions of any man, or description of men, either in or out of power; and that I wish no man to vote for me who is unwilling to leave me free to pursue the good of my country according to the best of my judgment, without respect either to party men or party views."

This theory of public service is, of course, in contravention to that which has been accepted as the basis of representative government in America. But I venture to suggest that it is not yet proven that better results might not be achieved if Davie's principle was practice. Nevertheless it defeated Davie, and he was content that it should be so, unless his countrymen could rise to its acceptance.

The chief reason for Davie's fear of misunderstanding was that he had been made the object of the astute Jefferson's wooing through the federal patronage. As early as 1801 he had been tendered a commission-

ership to treat with the southwestern Indians, which he declined. In 1802 he had accepted a commission to treat with the remnant of the Tuscaroras in North Carolina; but this was as much a state service as national. He never for a moment regarded himself as committed to any support of the Republican party, but remained its harsh critic. Vehemently he condemned the repeal of "Mid-night Judiciary Act," and expressed the view that soon there would be no other than the Lilliputian ties of the public debt to hold the states together.

In 1805 he retired to a valuable estate he owned in South Carolina, but kept up a continuous correspondence with his old Federalist friends in North Carolina. Never softening toward Jefferson, he nevertheless had hopes of Madison, due likely to the position in which Madison had stood at the formation of the Union. In 1810, while the country was still smarting under the effects of the embargo policy inherited from Jefferson's term, he wrote:

"I sincerely believe he (President Madison) is a man of great virtue. We all know he has sense and the experience of many years in public life, and *they now* say he has more promptitude and decision than any man who ever filled the presidential chair. May God grant that this may be true! Our affairs may yet do well."

Nevertheless when Madison's administration in 1812 drifted into war with England and the discontent of the New England states had culminated in the Hartford Convention, Davie wrote:

"The movement in the New England states and the monstrous strides toward despotism made by the party in power have so stunned and astounded me that I know not what to say or write. It really appears to me that the present confederacy will not last two years more and that Mr. Madison will finish his career amidst the ruins of his country."

The federalism of William Richardson Davie was summed up in a passionate regard for the unity and welfare of America.

An Eighteenth Century Circuit Rider

By Frank Nash
Assistant Attorney General of North Carolina

He was not one of those who at that period were bearing the evangel of mercy out into the bye-ways of life as well as into its highways, to the pioneer on the frontiers as well as to the villager in his store or workshop. Instead, he was a minister of justice and a sturdy but discriminating apostle of nationalism. He was born at Lewes, Sussex County, England, October 5th, 1751, came to Edenton in the Province of North Carolina in 1768, was a practicing attorney when he was nineteen years of age, married when he was twenty-two, a state judge when he was twenty-six, a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States before he was thirty-nine, and died when he was a few days over forty-eight.

Today Judge James Iredell is everywhere recognized as one of our great statesmen-jurists. President Washington had no personal acquaintance with him, but had read his reply to George Mason and his speeches in the Hillsboro Convention of 1788, and was much impressed by the weight and force of his argument in favor of the ratification of the new constitution. When then there was a vacancy on the new Supreme Court bench, caused by the declination of Mr. R. H. Harrison of Maryland, the President sent Iredell's name to the Senate on February 10, 1790 and it was immediately and unanimously confirmed. He had no previous knowledge of the president's intention, indeed had been considering applying for appointment as district judge of North Carolina.

The United States Supreme Court as then organized, consisted of six justices, a chief justice, and five associates. It was to convene twice a year at the seat of government to hear appeals from the circuit courts. The circuit courts were composed of three judges, any two of whom were to constitute a quorum;—a district judge, one of whom was appointed for each state, and two supreme court justices. There were three circuits constituted: Eastern—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut and New York, with Rhode Island and Vermont to be added later; Middle—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland and Virginia; Southern—South Carolina, and Georgia, with North Carolina to be added. The act required two justices of the Supreme Court to hold circuit courts in conjunction with the local district judge in each one

of these circuits twice a year. Any two of these, however, would constitute a quorum for holding the court. The salary fixed by the act for justices of the Supreme Court was $3,500 per year, with no allowance for expenses.

In this paper I am to try to depict some of the experiences of this great judge as he travelled about the country in performance of circuit court duties. In order that I may present to you some idea of his weightier duties understandingly, it is necessary that I should state in a general way the political situation in the country at that time. The Federal constitution had not been adopted without vigorous, almost savage, opposition by a large minority of the more prominent public men. To use a term coined recently in the political life of this country, there were many bitter-enders among these opponents. Indeed it may well be doubted whether or not the constitution would have been adopted at all if it had been submitted to a popular vote. This condition appealed very strongly to the statesman in Judge Iredell, so to him the constitution must be popularized not only by a wise administration of the laws enacted by congress in pursuance thereof, but also by a constant reiteration in his charges of its fundamental principles. The French Revolution had already broken out, and was to run its bloody course while he was on the bench. The country even at that period was filled with sympathizers with that revolution and a little later with propagandists of its peculiar tenets. President Washington's policy was one of strict neutrality. It became his duty then to enforce the laws of congress which were enacted to secure this neutrality. Congress also found it necessary to impose an excise tax on whiskey. This resulted in a furor of excitement in some sections of the country, culminating in the Whiskey Insurrection of Western Pennsylvania. Iredell presided over the trial of some of the insurgents. With the country in such a state, the duties of the circuit judges at that period were not only arduous in themselves, but also unpopular in some communities. Judge Iredell was peculiarly fitted for these duties at such a time. He had the manners and graces of the gentleman in the truest sense of the term. He was singularly kind-hearted and thoughtful of the feelings and interests of others. In social life he attracted both men and women and enjoyed life and association with his fellows. As a judge, he very soon extorted the admiration of the lawyers who practised before him, and made friends for himself and his cause wherever he held courts.

To Judge Rutledge of South Carolina and him was assigned the duty of holding the spring courts, 1790, of the Southern Circuit. He seems in traveling long distances of his first circuit to have availed himself

of stage-coaches, entering South Carolina in a stage which ran from Fayetteville to some point in that state. He is first heard from at Camden, being then on his way to Columbia at which the court was to sit. He had company all the way from Fayetteville to ten miles of Camden. He found his journey a thousand times more agreeable than he had expected. Of Camden he says, "This really is a very pretty town—a fine, high, healthy situation—and many very handsome houses in it." From Fayetteville to Camden he was astonished at the immense quantity of barren land. He arrived in Columbia on May 11th, spent about a week there, and went on to Charleston where he arrived on May 22nd. Judge Rutledge met him at Columbia, sat with him in the court, but I have no information as to the character of the business done. At Columbia he met most of the principal characters of the country who all behaved to him with extreme kindness. He went from Columbia direct to Charleston in Judge Rutledge's coach and accompanied by him, and was taken as a guest to his house in Charleston. In this delightful home he spent only a few days.

"They have a remarkably fine family of eight children; the eldest married to a Mr. Kinlock, a very agreeable young gentleman of large fortune, whom I saw at Columbia. Next is a son, who I believe is a very promising one indeed, who has been travelling in Europe for near three years and whom his father and mother expect to meet this summer at New York. A younger daughter is with her sister Mrs. Kinlock. The other five are sons now at home receiving education under an excellent private tutor. . . . . This city far exceeds my expectations. To-day I had the pleasure of attending a very handsome church, hearing as good a sermon as ever Crutchley preached, and I believe as well delivered; and also a very fine organ which was extremely agreeable."

In Charleston it is probable that nothing more was done than to organize the court, for on May 28th in company with Judge Rutledge he arrived at Savannah. He was very much impressed with the beauty and fineness of the road from Charleston to a plantation of Judge Rutledge's about twenty-five miles from the latter place. The latter part of the journey was made in a canoe paddled by four of Judge Rutledge's hands. He returned probably by the same route to North Carolina expecting that by that time North Carolina would have been included in the Southern Circuit by congress. On his appointment as judge he had removed his family from Edenton, North Carolina, to 63 Wall Street, New York City, where he arrived the latter part of July. He sums up his experiences on his first circuit thus:

"Had the weather not been so hot, my circuit would have been quite a jaunt of pleasure, for I have been everywhere received by everybody with the

utmost kindness and distinction, and by many of the first families in South Carolina with a degree of unaffected politeness which was gratifying indeed."

The August term of the Supreme Court convened in New York, but having no business after Judge Iredell's commission was read, adjourned *sine die*. On July 10th congress passed an act fixing the seat of goverment at a point on the Potomac where the city of Washingon is now located. The government itself was not to remove to the new city until December 1800. Meantime its seat was to be fixed at Philadelphia.

The Southern Circuit was assigned to Judges Rutledge and Iredell for the fall of 1790. The latter commenced his journey south in September, in the public stage, breakfasting at Elizabeth Town, dining at Brunswick, "a pretty little town," and arrived at Princeton some time before dark, fifty-one miles the day's journey. He described Princeton as a very pretty place, though in a high situation, level. At Elizabeth Town, they picked up Gen. Thomas Mifflin, who had been one of the Conway Cabal, which sought the removal of Gen. Washington during the Revolutionary War. He was then President of the Executive Council of Pennsylvania. Judge Iredell found him a very agreeable travelling companion. The next day they arrived at Philadelphia about 2 P. M.

"I have since dined with President Mifflin, our most agreeable fellow traveller, whose wine was so good and importunity so pressing that I could do nothing more since dinner but engage places in the Baltimore stage for Friday." [He left Philadelphia on Friday, September 17 and arrived at Baltimore, about 4 P. M. of Saturday, the 18th.] "I had taken my passage, without knowing there were two stages, in one by mistake [He does not attribute this mistake to the excellence of Gen. Mifflin's wine] by the eastern branch of the Chesapeake, so that we had to cross a ferry of 15 miles, but the wind was favorable, and upon the whole my time passed pleasantly. My company consisted of a Mr. Sharpe, a wine merchant of Philadelphia, a cheerful, clever man, with a modest, engaging young lady of Baltimore, who had been at a boarding school at Philadelphia, and a very decent seafaring man. Baltimore is a prettier place and more regularly built than I had expected to find it. There is a beautiful view from some parts of the town, but the finest country I have yet seen is Pennsylvania."

He attended church services in Baltimore that Sunday and heard a good organ, but a bad preacher. We know nothing further of his trip, until he arrived at Fayetteville, N. C., October 7th. His own horses and vehicle had probably met him at Suffolk, Virginia, and he made the rest of his journey, certainly through North Carolina, with them. He spent a whole day in Fayetteville to rest himself and to have his horses

shod. He kept the court open at Augusta, Georgia, for five days, awaiting the arrival of either Judge Rutledge or Judge Pendleton (the district Judge) to make a quorum to transact business. Judge Rutledge arrived on the 20th, but as they were both back in Charleston on the 23rd, it is supposed that there was little business transacted in Augusta. During his stay at Charleston, he was dined and wined daily, attended a ball, danced with the beautiful Mrs. Kinlock, oldest daughter of Judge Rutledge, and was not in bed until 2 A. M.

When the seat of government was removed from New York to Philadelphia, Judge Iredell found it advisable to remove his family also to that city.

Chief Justice Jay contended that the act of Congress which required the Supreme Court Justices to attend the circuit courts, was unconstitutional. Carson in his history of the Supreme Court, says that John Marshall concurred in this opinion of Jay's and did what he could reasonably to prevent the decision in *Stuart vs. Laird, Cranch 703,* which held that the opposite construction had been so long acquiesced in that it had become a rule of law.

At the August Term 1791 of the Court, a difference arose among the judges as to their circuits. The Act of Congress did not specifically fix the method, but seemed to leave it to the judges themselves. Carson thus states the result:

"Contrary to the expectation and wishes of the southern members of the Court, it was determined that the judges should be divided into pairs, and each pair be confined permanently to one circuit. Iredell, it seems, was taken by surprise, and Blair voted under a misconception. The burden of 'leading the life of a Postboy,' in a circuit of vast extent, under great difficulties of travel and peril of life in the sickly seasons, fell heavily upon Iredell, who applied to Congress for relief, but it was not until the Act of April 13th, 1792, providing that the judges should ride by turns the circuit most distant from the seat of government, that the difficulty was adjusted."

The Southern Circuit could be faithfully attended only by riding 1800 or 1900 miles, in perils of waters, and in weariness and painfulness. Judge Blair, however, as a matter of kindness to Judge Iredell rode the Southern Circuit in Spring of 1791, while Iredell with Judge Wilson rode the Middle Circuit. His correspondence covering this period seems to have been lost. While at Annapolis in riding the Middle Circuit, May 1791, he dined with Charles Carroll of Carrolton, whom he calls "the great Carroll." On his way to the Southern Circuit in the fall of that year, he stopped at a house in Virginia, and was put near a room where some young fellows were drinking, gaming,

and swearing all night. When he arrived at Salisbury in this state, he was forced to sleep in a room with five others, and in a bed with a fellow of the wrong sort. On his return trip, on his way from Wilmington to New Bern, his portmanteau was stolen from behind his carriage, and was found soon after on the road, rifled of much fine raiment. He rode the Southern Circuit again in the Spring of 1792. He went by sea to Charleston having in company Senator Butler of South Carolina and that gentleman's daughters. At Charleston he again experienced the delightful hospitality of its best citizens. On April 8th he writes his wife from that place:

"I have bought a pair of horses, and, agreeable to your wishes, not showy,—for they are confoundedly ugly. The price is $172.00. I may perhaps sell them for plow horses in North Carolina."

While in Charleston, too, he heard an excellent sermon from a Tory parson, who had been banished, and was preaching his first sermon since his return. He seems to have left Charleston for Savannah on Thursday, April 23, driving his new horses, attached to a chair, a two wheeled vehicle with shafts for a single horse, corresponding to our gig.

"Having understood that the horse in the chair was very gentle, and the road being a remarkably fine one, I was going on at my ease, when part of the rein getting under his tail, he ran away, the chair struck against a tree and overset, throwing me out, and one of the wheels went over my leg. I was able to proceed however (as the chair was not broken) about ten miles, but then was so much in pain, I was under the necessity of staying very inconveniently at a house on the road."

He met at Judge Bee's a very respectable, agreeable old gentleman, and, through his means, he stopped at genteel houses the rest of the way, where he lived elegantly and was treated with as much kindness as he could have experienced at Charleston. This old gentleman's name was Brailsford, and he may have been a suitor in the circuit court at a previous term. If so, he was a party to the first cause of note argued in the Supreme Court—*1. U. S. (Curtis) page 4.* Judge Iredell delivered his charge to the grand jury at Savannah on Monday, April 26, and this so pleased that body that they requested him to have it published. In that charge he states in a general but clear way his own conception of the dual form of government arising from the adoption of the Constitution:

"The happiness of our country certainly depends, not only on the preservation of our State governments in their due sphere of authority, but in the

firm union of the whole for the great purposes of the common welfare of the whole, which fatal experience has long since told us cannot be secured without an energetic government to effect it."

He found a great deal of important business. He seems though to have disposed of it in a week, for he set out for Augusta on Sunday May 2nd, with the marshal of the district, and arrived there Tuesday evening. He spent a week there, resting himself and horses very pleasantly at the house of the marshal. He found the town one of the most beautiful in America, and the weather cool enough for blankets at night. He left Augusta on the 11th of May and arrived at Columbia very early the morning of the 14th. At that place he finished the whole business of the court in one day. He says:

"I, everywhere, meet with great distinction and kindness, and have great reason to rejoice that I came southward: for otherwise the judiciary of the United States would have been greatly disgraced."

He, in company with Judge Wilson, rode the Eastern Circuit in the fall of 1792. They left New York by stage, between three and four o'clock Friday morning September 21st, and had not ridden many miles before it was discovered that the trunks of both of the judges had been lost off the stage. The unluck of commencing their journey on Friday did not pursue them far, for on going back for them, the trunks were recovered after two hours delay, an honest boy having picked them up and put them in a place of safety. They arrived at New Haven Saturday night. For the sin of travelling on Sunday they tried to atone by stopping along the road to attend a service. It proved to be a penance really, for the preacher was dull and the congregation not genteel. He was very much impressed with the beauty of the country. The roads, though, in many places were execrable; the worst Maryland roads a bowling green to them. There was much business at Hartford, where they arrived Sunday afternoon. Judge Iredell did not find Hartford so delightful as New Haven and other towns in Connecticut through which he had passed.

On March 23, 1792, Congress had passed an Act providing for the settlement of claims of widows and orphans of soldiers of the Revolution and to regulate the claims of invalid pensioners, and had imposed upon the circuit court certain duties in relation thereto, and subjected the action of the courts to the supervision of the Secretary of War, and finally to the revision of Congress. Some of the judges refused outright to obey Congress, while others temporized by acting as commissioners out of court in carrying out the purposes of the Act. Of

this number was Judge Iredell who at Hartford did all of this work, Judge Wilson positively declining to take any part in it. In less than a year Congress, recognizing the strength of the position assumed by the judges, imposed the duties upon an administrative body. On October 4th he wrote his wife:

"The Invalid business has scarcely allowed one moment's time, and now I am engaged in it by candlelight, though to go at three in the morning. I was at a ball the night before last, and staid until one. I danced a little, but it was not a remarkably agreeable one."

He arrived at Boston Saturday afternoon, October 6. Judge Wilson had returned to New York, so he was to hold the court there with the aid of Judge Lowell, the district judge. He was delighted with Boston, and was met most cordially and hospitably by its principal citizens, though there was a scourge of small-pox there and the town was still much afflicted. The Court was opened October 12, Judge Lowell, district judge, assisting. Judge Iredell's charge to the grand jury "united elegance with extensive knowledge and liberality," so was published in the *Columbian Sentinel*. There was much fatiguing work. One cause alone occupied almost the whole of the time for a week, and court did not adjourn until Saturday night. He was much impressed by the character and acquirements of the men whom he met, and attributed this largely to the public school system.

"I am satisfied that so much regularity and decency do not exist in any other country in the world, as in Connecticut and Massacnusetts: and I suppose it is much the same in New Hampshire."

Judge Wilson joined him on the 20th, and they went together to Exeter, N. H. There seems to have been little business in New Hampshire. The only interesting incident of their trip was their visit to Theophilus Parsons, subsequently a great Chief Justice of Massachusetts. Judge Iredell thought him the greatest lawyer he had met in America, and a very agreeable man. On his return to Boston he had the pleasure of dining with the Revolutionary patriots Samuel Adams and John Hancock, the latter then Governor of the state. At Providence, R. I. they found much business to do, but its character does not appear.

At the February term 1793, of the Supreme Court, the cause of *Chisholm vs. Georgia* came on for argument. In this case Judge Iredell delivered the great dissenting opinion, which gave rise to the 11th Amendment. This, however, is beyond the scope of this article. He, with Chief Justice Jay, rode the Middle Circuit in the Spring of 1793.

Judge Wilson, however, sat with him at the April Term of the Circuit Court at Philadelphia, where Ravara, consul of Genoa, was tried for sending threatening letters to Mr. Haywood, the British Minister. The defendant pleaded to the jurisdiction of the court that the Constitution gave exclusive original jurisdiction to the Supreme Court in cases concerning consuls of a foreign power, but the majority of the court, Wilson and Peters, Iredell dissenting, overruled this plea, holding that the term of the Constitution, "original jurisdiction" did not prevent congress from conferring concurrent jurisdiction on the Circuit Courts. The defendant was tried a year later in the same court, convicted, and subsequently pardoned by the President, on condition that he surrendered his commission and exequatur. On May 5th Judge Iredell was in Baltimore after passing most execrable roads. There he met the Attorney General of the state, whom he rather curiously calls the famous anti-Federalist, Luther Martin. He was then, however, in the process of changing his point of view, and did so change it afterwards, as to be called by Jefferson, the Federalist bull dog. He did not find Baltimore as attractive as either Boston or Charleston. He met Genet, the French minister there. He describes him as a very handsome man, with a fine open countenance, and pleasing, unaffected manners. As is well known he is the man who attempted to go over the heads of the administration in an appeal to the people of the country. On May 17, Judge Jay having arrived, they set out for Annapolis, where Judge Iredell delivered the charge to the grand jury. This charge, as with all he delivered, contained a full and complete explication of the dual relations of state and Federal governments. The first of the month they were in Richmond where the great case of *Ware vs. Hilton* was argued before them, the counsel for the plaintiff being Wickham, Ronald, Baker and Starke, while those for the defendant were Henry, Marshall, Innis and Campbell. Judge Iredell said of Henry:

"The great Patrick Henry is to speak today (May 27th). I never was more agreeably disappointed than in my acquaintance with him. I have been much in his company, and his manners are very pleasing, and his mind, I am persuaded, highly liberal."

Henry, commencing Monday, spoke for three consecutive days. On June 7th judgment was rendered for the defendant on his second plea, by Iredell and Griffin, Jay, C. J., dissenting. It being an action by a British creditor against an American debtor, on a bond executed before the war, the defendant pleaded that he had paid the full amount into the public treasury of the state of Virginia, under an Act of

the Legislature which authorized it. Iredell in an elaborate opinion held this, having been done before the Treaty of Peace, was a complete defence to the action. The Supreme Court reversed this, in *Ware vs. Hilton 1 U. S. (Curtis) 164,* Iredell adhering to his original opinion by filing that in the report of the case, p. 201. In this he said:

"The cause has been spoken to at the bar with a degree of ability equal to any occasion. However painfully I may at any time reflect on the inadequacy of my own talents, I shall, as long as I live, remember with pleasure and respect the arguments which I have heard on this case. They have discovered an ingenuity, a depth of investigation and a power of reasoning fully equal to anything I have ever witnessed, and some of them have been adorned with a splendor of eloquence surpassing what I have ever felt before. Fatigue has given way under its influence, and the heart has been warmed, while the understanding has been instructed."

There was another epidemic of yellow fever in Philadelphia the summer of 1793, and Iredell, preferring to endure the ills of malaria to those of small-pox in the winter and yellow fever in the summer in that city, he determined to remove his family to their old home in Edenton. This he did in the winter of 1793.

He rode the Southern Circuit in the Spring of 1794. His charge to the Grand jury at Wake Court House, June 2, is largely filled with a discussion of the legal aspect of French interference with the internal affairs of the United States. He refused to ride the same circuit in the Fall of that year, and probably did no circuit duty.

He rode the Eastern Circuit in the Spring of 1795, opening the court in New York on Monday, April 6th. There was little business and it was disposed of in two days. In Philadelphia he hired a young mulatto named David. "I am to find him in everything and pay him four dollars per month." He remained in New York two weeks after court adjourned, receiving very great civilities. He was in New Haven in time to open court on April 25th. He left that place on May 6th and arrived at Springfield, Massachusetts, seventy miles off on the morning of the 7th after travelling through a delightful country, passing several pretty towns, and enjoying most charming weather.

"I was" [said he] "certainly intended for a New England man. I admire the people and the country, as much as many of our Southern people affect to despise them."

"I found Mrs. Hancock just going to comfort herself for a slavish confinement for many years to a goutified, ill-tempered husband, by marrying a Captain Scott, an old captain in her former husband's employ."

As Vermont had been added to the Eastern Circuit, he went 115 miles from Springfield to Windsor, through a country which he found delightfully romantic. He was there for about a week, being shown many civilities by a small but genteel society. He was forced to return to Boston to get to Portsmouth, N. H., where his next court was to be held, there being no stage across the mountains above. While en route and in Vermont, he had presented to him a little boy, three years old named James Iredell, for himself. No doubt the little fellow's father had been indiscreet during the Revolution while in N. C. and Judge Iredell had protected him. Again in Boston, he experienced the delightful hospitality of the charming society there.

He seems not to have ridden any circuit in the Fall of 1795, but in November went to Richmond in the place of one of the other judges and held the court there. He found a great deal of business there.

"The town was so full that for three or four nights I was obliged to lodge in a room where there were three other beds."

In the Spring of 1796 he rode the Middle Circuit, commencing at Philadelphia, April 11th; but nothing of interest occurred. He was not on duty the fall of that year, but rode the Middle Circuit again in the spring of 1797. He began his courts at Trenton March 29th, where he continued for a week. One case took up much of the time of the court. He says of this case:

"I have but this minute come out of court, having sat there without moving for upwards of eleven hours."

He returned to Philadelphia April 5th and had a tedious waiting for the court to convene. He began hearing cases April 14, and continued for a week, going from there to Annapolis, Baltimore, and Richmond. His charge at Richmond, though unexceptional on its face, provoked a reply from Mr. Cabell, a member of Congress, in which he assailed the character and motives of Judge Iredell. In a calm and temperate explanation, the judge showed that Mr. Cabell was not in his mind at the time the charge was prepared, concluding thus:

"I defy him or any man to show that in the exercise of my judicial character, I have been ever influenced in the slightest degree by any man, either in or out of office, and I assure him I shall be as little influenced by this new mode of attack by a member of congress, as I can be by any other."

For taking any notice of Cabell's attack, his brother-in-law, Gov. Johnston, afterwards administered a mild rebuke to him. He seems

not to have been on circuit duty the fall of 1797. In the Spring of 1798 he rode the Southern Circuit. He set out from his home in Edenton, with his own chair and horses, accompanied by a negro man. He, after many trying adventures in flooded swamps, particularly Conetoe swamp in Edgecombe, found it impossible to cross Tar river at Tarboro, or to proceed in any other direction, so returned to Williamston. The floods receding in a few days, he continued his journey. He writes on May 1st:

"I was overtaken at the house where I staid last night by an itinerant Methodist preacher, who appears to be a very worthy good man, but extremely weak. He, and hundreds more, are employed by the Society, to go constantly about preaching; they receive their traveling expenses and $64.00 a year to find them in every thing."

There was little business in Charleston. Court was in session only one week, but he experienced again the delightful hospitality of its principal citizens. He commenced his return home, the Savannah court having been abandoned on account of his delay by floods, on May 14th, and, loitering on the way, at the country homes of friends, had not reached Camden four days later.

Judge Iredell held the courts of the Middle Circuit, commencing at Philadelphia, April 11th. At this term the first trial of Fries occurred. The trial began on April 29, and lasted through all its length, 15 days, *(3rd Dallas 515)*. The hearing of evidence and arguments of counsel occupied nine days. Judge Iredell wrote that there was an immense number of witnesses, and long arguments, and the Court sat ten hours a day.

"The jury went out at eight o'clock, and at their request we adjourned until ten. Though we were punctual to a moment, the court was so full we could hardly get to our seats. The Jury soon afterwards were announced, and after the clerk put the usual question, the foreman, after a most solemn pause, and in a very affecting tone of voice pronounced him guilty, which evidently had a sensible effect upon every person present."

The Court, however, set aside the verdict and granted a new trial, because one of the jurors, a man named Rhodes, had previous to his selection as juror expressed an opinion that the insurgents, and Fries particularly, were guilty of treason and should be hung. After the prolonged and arduous session at Philadelphia, he found at Richmond, June 4th, an immensity of business. Concluding the business of this court, he had only a few weeks at home when he commenced his return to be with the Supreme Court at Augusta session of that year. At

Richmond, July 31st, he was taken sick and was compelled to return home. He saw no more judicial service of any kind, but died at his home in Edenton, October 30, 1799. No doubt the arduous labors of the Circuits which he had been attending so faithfully, contributed to his early death. Says Mr. Carson:

"Such was James Iredell of North Carolina, the study of whose works cannot fail to awaken admiration of his qualities as a judge, and his virtues as a man."

This mere glance at the labors of the judicial circuit rider of the eighteenth century gives us some conception of their arduous character. The mere fact of riding great distances over the roads of the period and in the stage coaches of the period, exposed to all varieties of climate and weather, must have tried the constitution of the strongest man. Judge Iredell in his whole judicial career never shirked a duty. Instead, he sat in court hearing cases, where it was necessary, eleven hours at a stretch without taking nourishment or relaxation. Though he was a man of independent judgment, and so, quite frequently dissented from the views of his brothers on the bench, he was universally respected for his ability as a judge and his character as a man. To one, however, so even tempered, so kind-hearted, in short, so full of the charity which suffereth long and is kind, there were many compensations for his wearisome and sometimes dangerous journeys and his arduous labor. In Philadelphia he was the welcome guest of President Washington and his wife and later of President John Adams and the British minister. In New England he met and became the friend of Samuel Adams, John Hancock and Theophilus Parsons. In Virginia he came in pleasant association with Henry and Marshall and Wickham. In South Carolina he was received with kindness by Rutledge, Pinckney and Pickens. In his numerous stage coach journeys he met the casual passengers on the footing of a common manhood, whether they were senators, or judges, or statesmen, or wine merchants, or school girls, or seafaring men, or Methodist missionaries who were riding a greater circuit than his at the annual compensation of $64. And then, too, the warm-hearted hospitality with which he was met everywhere, the dinners given in his honor by cultivated men and women, the balls he attended and the beautiful young women with whom he danced. On one occassion he gives up a dance with one of these charming partners to write his letter to his wife, who through both the labors and the pleasures of his circuits, seemed to be ever present in his mind and heart. He, too, takes all these labors and pleasures in a manly whole-

souled way. He never complains of hardships of the way, not even when he barely escapes drowning in the flooded Conetoe Swamp of Edgecombe County, or when the gentle South Carolina horse deceived him and threw him out of his chair, or when in Salisbury he was compelled to sleep with five other men in the same room, one in bed with him and not an attractive bed fellow, or in Richmond where he was compelled for three days to occupy a bed room with three other men entire strangers to him. Nowhere in his correspondence do we perceive any of the acid which so often appears in the correspondence of his distinguished and wise but self-sufficient and opinionated brother-in-law, Samuel Johnston. He was, indeed, a good man. The whole world now recognizes him as a great man. Only the other day, August 25, 1920, the president of the American Bar Association, in his annual address said that his Richard Dobbs Spaight letter, written in 1787, stated with the utmost precision and strength the subsequently familiar doctrine of *Marbury vs. Madison.* As both good man and great man he belongs to North Carolina, is part of its history, and his fame is our heritage to be cherished and protected.

North Carolina Bibliography 1919-1920

By Mary B. Palmer

Secretary North Carolina Library Commission

This Bibliography covers the period from November 20, 1919 to November 30, 1920.

The term Bibliography is here used to include the works of all native North Carolinians, regardless of present residence, and the works of writers who although not born in North Carolina, have lived here long enough to become identified with the state. Pamphlets and periodical articles are not included.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Abbreviations and Symbols: c., copyright; il., illustrated; p., pages; v., volume. The capital letters, D. O. Q. S. T., refer to the size of the books.

Bassett, John Spencer. Our war with Germany; a history. O.386p. il. Knopf, 1919. $4.00.

Brooks, Eugene Clyde. Education for democracy; ed. by Lyman P. Powell. (Patriotism through literature.) D.263p. Rand, 1919. $1.25.

Connor, Henry Groves. John Archibald Campbell, associate justice of the United States Supreme Court, 1853-1861. O.310p. Houghton, 1920. $2.25.

Dixon, Thomas. Man of the people; a drama of Abraham Lincoln. D.155p. Appleton, 1920. $1.75.

Dodd, William Edward. The cotton kingdom; a chronicle of the Old South. O.161p. Yale Univ. press, 1919. (The chronicles of America series.) Subs. per series of 50 v., $175.00

Dodd, William Edward. Woodrow Wilson and his work. O.369p. maps. Doubleday, 1920. $3.00.

Douglas, John Jordan. The bells; il. by Lieut. John B. Mallard. D.104p. Presbyterian Standard Pub. Co., Charlotte, 1919.

Dowd, Jerome. Democracy in America. 500p. Harlow Publishing Co., Oklahoma City.

Dozier, Howard Douglas. A history of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad. O.197p. Houghton, 1920. $2.00. (Hart, Schaffner & Marx prize essays in economics.)

Ezekiel, Herbert Tobias and Lichtenstein, Gaston. comps. World war section of The history of the Jews of Richmond. O.381-443p. il. Richmond, Ezekiel, 1920. $2.00.
Ezekiel is not a North Carolinian but Lichtenstein is.

French, Alfred Llewelyn. A farmer's musings. D.102p. il. Edwards and Broughton, Raleigh, 1920.

Henderson, Archibald. The conquest of the old Southwest; the romantic story of the early pioneers into Virginia, the Carolinas, Tennessee and Kentucky, 1740-1790. D.395p. il. Century, 1920. $3.00.

Johnson, Clarence Walton. The history of the 321st Infantry with a brief historical sketch of the 81st Division. O. il. R. L. Bryan Co., Columbia, S. C., 1919.

Kirkland, Winifred Margaretta. The view vertical and other essays. D.270p. Houghton, 1920. $2.00.

Lichtenstein, Gaston. See Ezekiel, H. T.

Pearson, Thomas Gilbert; Brimley, Clement Samuel; Brimley, Herbert Hutchinson. Birds of North Carolina (Reports, v. 4). Q.380p. il. North Carolina Geological and economic survey, Chapel Hill, 1919. $3.50.

Pell, Edward Leigh. Bringing up John. D.192p. Revell, 1920. $1.75.

Pell, Edward Leigh. How can I lead my pupils to Christ? Revell, 1919. $1.00.

Pell, Edward Leigh. Our troublesome religious questions. Revell. $1.50.

Smith, Charles Alphonso. Poe (How to know authors). 346p. Bobbs, 1920. $2.00.

Smith, Charles Alphonso and McMurry, Mrs. Lida Brown. Smith-McMurry language series. 3 bks. D.208;256;270p. bk. 1, 64c; bk. 2, 68c; bk. 3, 70c. 79. Johnson, B. F.

SPRUNT, JAMES. Derelicts: an account of ships lost at sea in general commercial traffic and a brief history of blockade runners stranded along the North Carolina coast, 1861-1865. O.304p. pri. ptd. A. Sprunt and Son, Wilmington, N. C., 1919.

SULLIVAN, WILLARD P. and TUCKER, HARRY. The history of the 105th Regiment of engineers of the Old Hickory (30th) Division. Q. il. 466p. maps. Doran, 1919.

TUCKER, HARRY. See SULLIVAN, WILLARD P.

TURNER, J. KELLY and BRIDGERS, JNO. L. History of Edgecombe County. O.486p. Edwards and Broughton, Raleigh, 1920. $5.00.

WINSTON, GEORGE TAYLOE. A builder of the New South being the story of the life work of Daniel Augustus Tompkins. O.403p. Doubleday, 1920. $3.00.

CONTINUATIONS

The most important addition to North Carolina continuations was the Southern Review, published at Asheville. The first number was issued in January, 1920.

MINUTES OF THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL SESSION

Minutes of the Twenty-first Annual Session of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina

THURSDAY EVENING, December 1st.

The twenty-first annual session of the Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina was opened at 8 P. M., Thursday, December 1st, 1921, in the auditorium of the Woman's Club, Raleigh, N. C., with President D. H. Hill in the chair. An invocation was pronounced by Dr. Burton Alva Konkle of the Pennsylvania Historical Society. President Hill read the president's address. His subject was "The Confederate Ordnance Department."

Mr. Homer L. Ferguson, President of the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company, who was to speak on "Shipbuilding During the World War," was prevented from coming on account of a business emergency. Dr. Benjamin Sledd, of Wake Forest College, kindly consented to supply the deficiency in the program. He spoke on "North Carolina Poets." At the conclusion of Dr. Sledd's address there was an informal reception in the Club building for the members of the Association and the members of the North Carolina Folk Lore Society, and their guests.

FRIDAY MORNING, December 2nd.

The meeting was called to order in the Hall of the House of Representatives, by President Hill. The following program of exercises was transacted in the order named:

Paper—"North Carolina Bibliography, 1920-1921," by Miss Mary B. Palmer, Secretary of the North Carolina Library Commission.

Paper—"The Historian and the Daily Press," by Gerald W. Johnson, Associate Editor of the *Greensboro Daily News*.

Paper—"An Old Time North Carolina Election," by Miss Louise Irby, Professor of History, North Carolina College for Women.

Reading—Original poem, "Raleigh and Roanoke" by Reverend John Jordan Douglass, Pastor First Presbyterian Church, Wadesboro.

Paper—"The Bread and Butter Element in North Carolina History," by D. D. Carroll, Dean of the School of Commerce, University of North Carolina.

At the conclusion of the exercises the president recognized Miss Lula Briggs, who introduced Mrs. D. H. Blair of Greensboro, Historian

General of the D. A. R. Mrs. Blair presented in the name of the D. A. R. to the Association, two volumes of North Carolina War Service Records 1914-1919.

The president appointed the following committees with instructions to report at the evening session:

Resolutions: T. M. Pittman, F. B. McDowell, and Bennehan Cameron.

Nominations: W. C. Jackson, R. D. W. Connor, and D. T. Smithwick.

The president read the following communication:

The Managers of the Duo-Centennial of the formation of Bertie County, October 2, 1722, invite the State Literary and Historical Association to hold its next annual meeting in Windsor, N. C., during the week including October 2, 1922.

FRANCIS D. WINSTON, CHAIRMAN.

This matter was referred, under the by-laws, to the incoming executive committee.

The president recognized Mrs. H. A. London, who presented to the Association a copy of the Bail Bond of Jefferson Davis.

The matters of increasing the dues, honorary membership, and sustaining members were referred to the incoming executive committee.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, DECEMBER 2ND.

There was a conference of history teachers in the rooms of the North Carolina Historical Commission. The conference was called to order at 3:30 P. M., December 2nd, by Dean W. C. Jackson, of the North Carolina College for Women. The following were present: R. D. W. Connor, E. C. Brooks, R. G. Adams, W. E. Stone, W. A. Graham, John Jordan Douglass, Miss L. Becker, Miss Louise Irby, T. M. Pittman, Bennehan Cameron, T. P. Harrison, Mrs. E. L. Whitehead, Miss Mary Price, and R. B. House.

There was a general discussion of materials of North Carolina history, the use of these materials, the need of a published source book of North Carolina history. The discussion was concluded by a motion from Mr. Pittman that D. H. Hill, E. C. Brooks, and Miss Mary B. Palmer be appointed a committee to look into the practicability of publishing a source book of North Carolina history. The motion was carried.

It was recorded as the sense of the meeting that similar conferences should be held each year in connection with the annual sessions of the Literary and Historical Association.

FRIDAY EVENING, December 2nd.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 in the auditorium of Meredith College, by the president who introduced Dr. Samuel McChord Crothers, of Cambridge, Mass. Dr. Crothers addressed the Association on "Literary Fashions and Literary Values." At the conclusion of this address the committee on nominations presented the following report, which was unanimously adopted:

Officers of the State Literary and Historical Association

The Committee report as follows:

President—Dr. W. K. Boyd, Professor of History, Trinity College, Durham.

1st Vice-President—Capt. S. A. Ashe, Historian, Clerk of the Federal Court, Raleigh.

2nd Vice-President—Mrs. D. H. Blair, Retiring Historian, D. A. R., Greensboro.

3rd Vice-President—Rev. John Jordan Douglass, Poet, Presbyterian Minister, Wadesboro.

Secretary-Treasurer—R. B. House, Archivist, Raleigh.

(Signed) D. T. Smithwick,
For the Committee.

The Committee on Resolutions offered the following resolutions which were adopted:

Whereas there is now a memorial before Congress for the marking of the scene in Alamance County, of the destruction of the Tory force organized at Hillsboro under Colonel John Pyle—an engagement that exerted a very marked influence on the campaign then in progress,

Resolved, therefore, that the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina respectfully ask our Senators and Representatives in Congress to favor and to further this patriotic step in any way within their power.

Resolved, that the best interests of society require that our youth shall be correctly informed concerning the history of our country. To that end we recommend that those in authority place such histories in our schools as shall be free from sectionalism and just to every part of our country.

Thomas M. Pittman,
F. B. McDowell,
Bennehan Cameron.
Committee.

ADDRESSES

Confederate Ordnance Department

By D. H. Hill

President of the State Literary and Historical Association

It has often been asserted that the Southern people are lacking in inventive genius and organizing skill. If there were no other facts—and there are many—to disprove this assertion, the record of the Ordnance Department of the Confederate States goes far to remove such an impression.

The South in its zeal to contend for what it considered as constitutional rights went to war, as President Davis bluntly says "without counting the cost." Its five million white people arrayed themselves against the twenty million of the North. Its agricultural population pitted itself against a diversified manufacturing people with access at home and abroad to every sort of raw and manufactured material. Its laborers skilled mainly in farming had to vie with artisans who had served their apprenticeship in almost every modern trade. Its wealth, resting largely on cotton and tobacco, the value of which dwindled as soon as the northern navy cut these products off from markets, was at that period vastly inferior to that of the North.

In addition to these insuperable disadvantages, its newly set up and experimental government had to contend against an established government with every department already functioning with a skill born of experience, with a far-reaching credit, with custom duties bringing in large revenues, with consular agents to collect information about commodities and to mould sentiment in every considerable foreign port, with an excellent navy to protect its mercantile vessels and blockade Confederate harbors, and with a regular army large enough to set a high standard of efficiency for its volunteers.

Truly it took sublime confidence in its cause, stout hearts, and a willingness to suffer, for the South to appeal to arms under these circumstances, circumstances not unknown to thoughtful Southerners.

The first opportunity—and perhaps the most favorable opportunity, for Confederate success came just after the paralyzing Southern victory at First Manassas. Could the Confederate army shortly after that battle have pressed into the North before the Democrats, Bell, and

Everett men had become wedded to the Union cause, before the business men of the North had ceased to fret over the loss of Southern trade, before mammoth mercantile and mechanic corporations had taken up war fabrication, before the Union navy had been increased by purchases and conversions, before the enormous masses of raw troops that were pouring into Washington to take the places of the three months volunteers had been moulded into a grand army by the organizing genius of McClellan, then most likely another signal victory on its own soil would have induced the North to follow Greeley's advice and let the erring sisters "depart in peace."

Ropes, in many ways the ablest Northern writer on the war, thus presents his views on this opportunity:

"It is altogether probable that the Confederate army was at that time decidedly the superior of its antagonist in many important respects. It had the prestige of victory. It had the self-confidence and audacity which the unfortunate panic which overtook their foes after the battle of Manassas was over, could hardly fail to produce in the minds of the victors. It trusted its generals fully,—it believed in them enthusiastically. It was the only army in the country on either side that had won a considerable battle. It was the envy and pride of the Confederate soldier, ... and while we do not for a moment suppose that Johnston's army was equal to either of the Confederate armies of Antietam or Gettysburg in point of efficiency, yet it would have considerable advantages over any troops which McClellan could have opposed to it as early as October, 1861. They must have been for the most part raw and undisciplined, unacquainted with their brigade and divisional commanders, and necessarily affected unfavorably to a greater or less extent by the fact of Bull Run having been a bad defeat for the Union forces. We may fairly say, therefore, that an invasion of the North undertaken, in October, 1861, held out a very fair promise of a successful result for the Confederate arms."

Was the South unaware of this opportunity? Not at all. Its three ranking officers at Manassas—Johnston, Beauregard, and G. W. Smith, —in a conference that they sought with Mr. Davis urged this very step. The Confederate President makes it plain that he too was unwilling to wage the war "on a purely defensive system," but he could not furnish the 20,000 or 30,000 additional troops stated by the three generals to be necessary for such an invasion. Hence the opportunity so rich in promise was lost.

This decision then raises another question. Was the South so little in earnest that, after setting up a government of its own, it was unwilling to furnish soldiers to fight for that government? Not so by any means. It may surprise you to know that at that very time the Con-

federate Secretary of War was declining to accept thousands of volunteers. You may feel inclined, on hearing this, to ask "Was he a traitor or an ignoramus?" Neither. On August 31, 1861, Mr. Walker, the first Secretary of War, makes plain the reasons for this amazing fact. He says:

"We have thousands of good and true men prepared for the field in camps of instruction, *yet they are without arms.* We could bring into the field and maintain there with ease 500,000 men were arms and munitions sufficiently abundant."

In December, 1861 Judah P. Benjamin, who succeeded Walker, writes to Mr. Davis as follows:

"On (my) first entering on the duties of the Department (in September 1861) the tenders of troops were very large, and it was not at all unusual for me to refuse offers of 5,000 men per day."

Thus it appears that an inability to arm its eager volunteers precluded the South from seizing its first clearly discerned opportunity of achieving its goal. It was to supply these arms, of course, that the Ordnance Department about which I am to speak to you, was created.

In spite of the oft-repeated and hard-to-die misrepresentation that Secretary Floyd of Buchanan's cabinet, in anticipation of war, stocked the armories of the Southern states with small arms, the South's proportion of national arms was small. The official report of the Chief of Ordnance of the United States discloses the fact that in January, 1860, there were in government armories 610,262 small-arms of diverse patterns and varying degrees of inefficiency. Of these 410,671 were distributed in the North, 163,806 in the South, and 33,734 in the divided state of Missouri. These 163,806 muskets, mostly smooth-bores that had been only in part altered from flint and steel to percussion locks, were with the exception of a few state-owned, antiquated guns, the only small arms available for battle. So severe were the straits for arms that several of the states bought fowling-pieces and sporting rifles for their infantry and made spears for their cavalry.

In artillery there was the same destitution. So far as can be made out from the incomplete reports, there were in 1861 only 716 heavy guns to defend 3000 miles of sea-coast and to protect the banks of almost a countless number of navigable rivers. Moreover, 192 of these guns were in two forts and most of them were of obsolete types. Some of them were decrepit survivors of the War of 1812. A disgusted officer described one of them as "venerable and picturesque in appearance."

The caliber of Lee's guns was so diverse that the Ordnance Department was driven almost to desperation to supply so many types of ammunition.

For the third arm, cavalry, which was the natural service for Southerners inasmuch as they were bred to the saddle, there were not only no arms, but saddles, bridles, blankets, and even horse-shoes were almost unobtainable. The brilliant service of Stuart's small band of troopers at First Manassas is indicative of what might have been achieved if the hundreds of cavalry regiments that were offered could have joined their dash to the infantry.

As scant as were arms, the supply of ammunition and soldierly equipage was even more disturbing. At the opening of hostilities there were, outside of the amount seized at Norfolk, only 60,000 pounds of powder in the Confederacy. Of lead there was none. The stock of percussion caps did not exceed a quarter of a million. Secretary Walker's answer to pointed interrogations of the Confederate Congress startled desperately the complacent propounders, for it disclosed that before the captures at Manassas the remaining war resources of the Confederacy on August 12, 1861, were 3,500 flintlock rifles, 200,000 pounds of powder, 240 tons of saltpeter, 300 tons of sulphur, and one contract for lead. The desperate condition may be summed as follows: The Government possessed none of the implements of war; second, it had no machinery for making these implements; third, it had no raw material to feed machines for making the implements. The situation was more graphically described than I can do it in conventional terms by one of the officers when he said, "We are in a h— of a fix."

I wish time permitted a full description of the men who managed to supply, out of nothing but indomitable wills, the material for carrying on a four year war. Josiah Gorgas, a graduate of West Point, then just resigned from the Ordnance Department of the United States Army, was placed at the head of this apparently forlorn hope. Gorgas was a student of science and of men. He possessed an original and constructive mind, and deserved General Joseph E. Johnston's tribute: "Gorgas created the Ordnance Department out of nothing." In passing it is illustrative of American life to note that the name and fame of this officer in the Confederate Army has been perpetuated into our generation by the name and fame of an equally brilliant son in the United States army, Surgeon-General W. C. Gorgas, whose success in the control of yellow fever and in making our Canal Zone habitable has elicited the admiration of the world.

Gorgas gathered around him a notable group of officers. These included such gifted minds as those of I. M. St. John, Chief of the Bureau

of Mines and Niter; Dr. John W. Mallet, Superintendent of Laboratories, and afterwards widely known as a versatile and learned chemist in the Universities of Texas and Virginia; Colonel George W. Rains, in charge of powder manufacture and powder plants, a brother of General Gabriel J. Rains, the inventor of the torpedo, both brothers being natives of this state and graduates of West Point; Colonel Richard Morton, and others. John Mercer Brooke, the Chief Ordnance officer of the Navy, the designer of the Merrimac, and the inventor of the famous Brooke gun, worked in conjunction with this group.

There was dire need of such men, and it is impossible to understand the heroism of the Confederate struggle unless we comprehend the patience, the foresight, the ingenuity, the scientific attainments of these resolute men behind the guns. Gorgas thus describes the task assigned him in April, 1861:

"Within the limits of the Confederate States there were no arsenals at which any of the material of war was constructed. No arsenal except that at Fayetteville, North Carolina, had a single machine above a foot-lathe. Such arsenals as there were had been used only as depots. All the work of preparation of material had been carried on at the North; not an arm, not a gun, not a gun-carriage, and except during the Mexican War, scarcely a round of ammunition had for fifty years been prepared in the Confederate States. There were consequently no workmen, or very few of them, skilled in these arts. No powder, save perhaps for blasting, had been made in the South; there was no saltpetre in store at any Southern point; it was stored wholly at the North. There was no lead nor any mines of it except on the Northern limits of the Confederacy in Virginia and the situation of that made its product precarious. Only one cannon foundry existed—at Richmond. Copper, so necessary for field artillery and for percussion caps, was just being produced in East Tennessee. There was no rolling mill for bar iron south of Richmond; and but few blast furnaces and these small, and with trifling exceptions in the border states of Virginia and Tennessee."

The first necessity after arms was, of course, powder. The three ingredients—charcoal, sulphur, saltpeter or niter—as well as the mills for working them up had to be provided. The charcoal was readily obtained from ordinary pits. An adequate supply of sulphur for early operations was secured from the sugar refiners of the far South, and subsequently some was extracted from iron pyrites. The scarcity of saltpeter or niter was a most serious difficulty. Niter-bearing caves were sought in all the region traversed by the Appalachian mountains. Private production was stimulated by generous contracts and by offers of governmental aid in financing new plants. A refinery for the crude material was established at Nashville, Tennessee. As the war advanced,

it became evident that, owing to difficulties arising from conscription, inadequate transportation, and lack of technical skill, the Government would have to undertake the production not only of ordnance but of ordnance material, even to the mining of ores.

"In addition, [says Secretary Benjamin] to the articles usually manufactured in a military laboratory, it has become necessary to manufacture for the use of the war laboratories, articles usually found in the shops. Sulphuric acid, nitric acid, different metallic salts, and a variety of chemicals can be obtained for the use of the laboratories only by our manufacturing them."

Accordingly a Bureau of Niter and Mining, with Colonel I. M. St. John as chief, was established. This industrious officer divided the niter-bearing areas into districts with an officer in charge of each district. When the Bureau was formed on April 11, 1862, the total production of niter in the Confederacy did not reach 500 pounds a day. Within three months after its establishment, the Bureau had sixteen niter caves, employing 387 men, in operation. By July 30, it had collected and refined 60,338 pounds of niter, taken over and enlarged two lead mines, and erected an admirable smelting-work at Petersburg, Virginia. From this humble beginning the Bureau made rapid strides in production. The reports at the close of 1864 show a yearly production from government and supervised caves of 1,735,531 pounds of niter and an importation of 1,720,072—a total of 3,455,603 pounds. Of this amount 238,907 pounds were produced in North Carolina at a cost of $163,983.68. This supply came from scraping nitrified soil from under homes, tobacco-barns, smoke-houses, barns, and hen-houses. To provide a reserve supply thirteen nitriaries were established by St. John at convenient places. The beds in these require time for ripening and the war closed before any niter was made from them, but Colonel St. John states that 2,800,000 cubic feet of earth had been collected and was in various stages of nitrification.

In spite of the fact that in 1864 ten of the Virginia and all of the Georgia iron furnaces and the principal copper mines were captured or destroyed by the Federals, and that in the last quarter of 1864 there were no returns from Alabama, South Carolina, and Tennessee, the Bureau's report for the same two years as above shows that it supplied the munition workers with 27,189 tons of iron, 823,349 pounds of copper, and 4,795,331 pounds of lead, and that the sulphuric acid chambers of its chemical works at Charlotte, North Carolina, were turning out an average yield of from 4,000 to 5,000 pounds a month.

Coincident with its development of the Niter Bureau, the Ordnance Department pressed vigorously the manufacture of powder at governmental and at private mills, and the development of armories and arsenals for making cannon, small arms, ammunition, and all military equipment. Under the superintendence of Colonel George W. Rains, (a most accomplished ordnance officer,) the Department built at Augusta, Georgia, a central powder mill that Gorgas describes as "far superior to any in the United States and unsurpassed by any across the ocean." This establishment with its twelve grinders had a daily capacity of 5,000 pounds. The Richmond mill, starting later than the others, was designed to produce daily about 1,500 pounds. The mill at Selma, Alabama, made up 500 pounds a day. The State of North Carolina aided Waterhouse & Bowes to erect near Raleigh a mill with a daily yield of 600 pounds. The state was furnished with niter and sulphur by the Confederate Government and sold the entire production of powder to the Ordnance officers. These four mills furnished, therefore, 7,600 pounds each day. The Confederate Navy owned an excellent mill at Columbia, South Carolina. There were a few private mills—one at Charlotte, North Carolina, and for a time one at New Orleans, and a few state-aided mills. With the output from these mills supplemented by the cargoes which came through the blockade, there was always less anxiety about powder than there was about lead and copper.

After the capture of the Ducktown copper mines and the Wytheville lead mines the Ordnance Department was desperately straightened to keep the munitions plants in copper and lead. From the beginning of the war the country and the battlefields had been gleaned for lead. The city of Charleston, by the sacrifice of its window-weights, water pipes, and odds and ends, contributed 200,000 pounds. Mobile, digging up the pipes of a discarded water system, furnished nearly the same amount. The State Ordnance office in Raleigh, which accepted only such as was offered and tried not to compete with the regular Bureau officers, bought 27,885 thousand pounds of scrap lead in amounts varying from 5 to 800 pounds. The state also transferred to the Ordnance Bureau 36,017 pounds from importations through the blockade-runner, the *Advance*.

After the Confederate calamities on the Mississippi River, the three main sources of what Gorgas calls "this precious metal" were all in jeopardy: first, the supply of scrap lead was constantly diminishing; second, the importations through the blockade were seriously imperilled by the loss of Southern ports; third, the Wytheville mines, the only largely productive ones, were constantly menaced by the enlarged operations of the Federal armies.

In his annual report for the year closing September 30, 1864, Gorgas, after calling attention to the fact that his reserve of lead had been exhausted by the fierce fighting from Chancellorsville through Cold Harbor, was impelled to warn the Secretary of War that he "felt more uneasiness on this point than on all others."

The Ordnance Department was always confronted, too, with a shortage of copper, a metal almost as necessary to munition shops as lead. The supply was fairly sufficient as long as the Ducktown mines were held by the Confederates and as the ever-useful blockade runners could make Southern ports. When, however, the Tennessee mines passed into Union hands and the activity of the blockade traffic was checked, the ordnance officers had to resort to every sort of shift to secure copper or find substitutes for it. As the pressure for copper became greater, cities gave their clocks, churches their bells, and women stripped their homes of brass kettles, andirons, and candle-sticks. The country was searched with inquisitive eyes and forceful hands for the copper worms of turpentine and whiskey distilleries. The turpentine distillers were paid for their material; that of the whiskey-makers was confiscated as part of an illegal traffic. The chief of the Ordnance Bureau, in his December 31, 1864, report points out the scarcity of copper and steel. He says:

"These articles must be obtained chiefly from abroad, and the stock on hand is very small. The Bureau is constantly making substitutes of iron in every possible way to diminish the consumption and eke out the supply."

Iron was never so scarce as lead and copper. Although the Southern people had never been widely drawn to mining, there were some well-equipped mines and furnaces. Fortunately, this ore smelted with wood, had an unusually high tensile strength. This toughness of texture offset in a measure the defects which arose from the inexperience of the early gun-makers, but until skill had been attained frequent burstings caused a "Richmond gun" to be viewed with apprehension. As the manufacture of cannon and projectiles increased, it became necessary to stimulate iron production in Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama.

"To this end contracts were made with iron-masters in these states on liberal terms and advances of money to be refunded in products. These contracts were difficult to arrange, as so much had to be done for the contractor. He must have details from the army and the privilege of transporting provisions and other supplies over the railroads. Then, too, the question of the currency was always recurring."

Munition plants as well as all private industries had to rely largely on detailed soldiers or retained conscripts for all skilled or even trainable workmen. Most of the men above conscript age, even if they could have acquired skill at their ages, were required on the farms. Negroes could be relied on for the rough work, and disabled soldiers and women for the clerical duties, but the army had to furnish the competent artisans. These men were, of course, subject to instant recall. Whenever a Federal raid or a general advance into the neighborhood of a mine or furnace impended, or whenever the Confederate armies were gathering for serious fray, all the detailed men and conscripts in reach would have to drop spades and hammers and take up muskets. Production, of course, declined in proportion to the duration of their withdrawal. As the Confederate armies dwindled from wounds and deaths, the demand for soldiers stripped the shops and arsenals of most of their vigorous workmen. During the last twelve months of the contest practically only superintendents, foremen, and a few indispensable mechanics in each plant were left to stagger forward with the burden as best they could. The managers had to employ boys under eighteen and such men over forty-five as could be spared from some farm.

By overcoming innumerable difficulties the Ordnance Bureau was delivering some arms and munitions from eight arsenals and four supply depots before the close of the first trying year of the war. Owing to the vicissitudes of war, there were other plants added and some discontinued. Those west of the Mississippi were practically closed after the capture of New Orleans. The plant at Nashville was removed to Atlanta, and then, on Sherman's approach, to Columbus. The one at Mount Vernon, Alabama, was transferred to Selma. This arsenal was later turned over to the Confederate navy and there Commander Brooke "made many of his formidable banded and rifled guns." The strain-resisting castings made from the tough iron of this section gave to the completed batteries of field artillery from this arsenal a special value. The shops at the Montgomery arsenal were mainly used for the repair of small arms and for the manufacture of leathern articles. A factory for harness for artillery horses was set up at Clarksville, Virginia. The arsenal at Charleston was enlarged in order that it might do varied repair work. The Bureau located a combination plant, consisting of foundry, shops, and ordnance laboratory, at Salisbury, North Carolina. The private arsenal at Asheville, after being taken over by the Government, was moved to Columbia for greater security.

The same vexations and expense that prevailed in preparing and distributing artillery projectiles for guns of widely different calibers, existed in the small arm ammunition. The Confederate infantry, in the first months of war, bore into battle as motley an aggregation of arms as ever distressed an ordnance train. Not infrequently a regiment that had exhausted its ammunition could not borrow from a neighboring regiment, nor be supplied from the nearest wagons, because of a difference in the calibration of arms.

As early as circumstances would permit, the War Department took steps to obviate this harassment and at the same time to effect an improvement in the quality of the ammunition, which in some of the arsenals had been very unsatisfactory. The first step was to appoint Major J. W. Mallet, an accomplished chemist, superintendent of all the laboratories. By a rigid system of supervision which secured more uniformity of processes, Mallet "produced marked improvement in the ammunition fabricated, in spite of deficient labor and materials." The second step was to begin two central plants at Macon, Georgia; one under Colonel Burton, to manufacture standard rifles; the other, under Colonel Mallet, to produce standard ammunition. The machinery for both the armory, which was to have a capacity of 10,000 arms a month, and for the arsenal, was bought in Europe and was in Nassau and Bermuda when the war ended. A third step was to set up factories in Europe under private names and import the output.

The first two armories to begin the making of small arms were those that grew out of the arsenals at Fayetteville, North Carolina, and at Richmond. Both began operations with seized machinery. When the United States Armory at Harper's Ferry, Virginia, was set on fire by the evacuating Federal troops, the gun-making machinery was saved by the Virginia soldiers, who entered on the heels of the retiring Unionists. All the machinery used for making the Mississippi rifles (caliber 54) was sent to Fayetteville where there was a small, but well appointed arsenal, with a newly-installed steam service. The other machinery was transferred to Richmond.

After the installation of its rifle-making machinery, the Fayetteville armory's production, when running full-handed, was 10,000 rifles a year; it rarely ran to its capacity. The Richmond arsenal and armory, working in conjunction with the Tredegar Iron Works and with private contractors, grew into an establishment of very large proportions. While its capacity output of small-arms was reckoned at only 25,000 a year, it contributed a wide variety of military necessities. The small arsenal at Columbia, using the machinery removed from Asheville, was counted

on for 4,000 rifles each year. The armories at Tallahassee, Alabama, and at Athens, Georgia, had a productive power respectively of 6,000 carbines and 10,000 rifles. By the close of 1864 these five armories then could, when provided with laborers, make up 55,000 rifles a year.

The duties of the Ordnance Department included the importation as well as manufacture of war material, but time will not permit any discussion of the invaluable foreign blockade-running operations of the Department. Suffice it to say that loans, based on cotton, enabled the department to supply the Confederacy by September 30, 1863, 113,504 excellent small arms. The number was subsequently increased, including state importations, to 185,000. This number, to which must be added the 63,000 produced to that date, and the 150,000 captured, brings the total Confederate supply of small arms to 423,000. This is the entire supply with which the Confederates fought for four years. To Nov. 16, 1863, 677 pieces of field artillery, with their carriages, caissons, harness, etc., were bought and made. The same official report (Official Records IV, 2,958) shows that the following articles were either repaired, purchased, or fabricated: 209,910 rounds of ammunition for heavy guns; 446,719 for field artillery; 37,553,654 rounds of small-arm ammunition; 46,972,599 musket caps; 1,457,057 pounds of powder; 226,450 haversacks; 163,522 cartridge-boxes; 85,291 canteens, and a long array of other articles.

A world of ingenuity was lavished on substitutes for unprocurable material as well as on labor-saving and time-saving devices. When copper, with which Brooke and other ordnance scientists banded their rifled guns, could no longer be secured, an excellent substitute was found in tough iron bands. When the supply of mercury failed the chemists found that a mixture of chlorate of potash and sulphuret of antimony made just as good musket-caps as fulminate of mercury. Cloth stitched into several folds and coated with shellac took the place of leather in belts, bridle-reins, saddle-skirts, haversacks, etc. Rains introduced a method of making powder that vastly improved that article. Captain R. S. Williams invented a multiple firing gun. The Department devised ways of using Reed's process for improving rifled shells, for developing a shell with polygonal cavities, for the better timing of fuses, for the fabrication from cotton cloth of a rain-proof material for coats, blankets, etc. When the linseed oil for this process became scarce, a fishery for making the oil was established at the mouth of the Cape Fear River.

When we recall these achievements and others that might be mentioned, we feel that we can join Gorgas in his tribute to his fellow workers:

"We began in April, 1861, without an arsenal, laboratory or powder mill of any capacity, and with no foundry or rolling mill except at Richmond, and before the close of 1863, in a little over two years, we had built up, during all the harassments of war, holding our own in the field definitely and successfully against a powerful and determined enemy. Crippled as we were by a depreciated currency; throttled with a blockade that deprived us of nearly all means of getting material or workmen; obliged to send almost every able-bodied man to the field; unable to use the slave labor with which we were abundantly supplied, except in the most unskilled departments of production; hampered by want of transportation even of the commonest supplies of food; with no stock on hand even of the articles such as steel, copper, lead, iron, leather, which we must have to build up our establishments; and in spite of these deficiencies we persevered at home as determinedly as our troops did in the field against a more tangible opposition, and in a little over two years created almost literally out of the ground foundries and rolling mills (at Selma, Richmond, Atlanta, and Macon), smelting works (at Petersburg), chemical works (at Charlotte), a powder mill far superior to any in the United States and unsurpassed by any across the ocean, and a chain of arsenals, armories, and laboratories equal in their capacity and their improved appointments to the best of those in the United States, stretching link by link from Virginia to Alabama. Our people are justly proud of the valor and constancy of the troops who bore their banners bravely in front of the enemy, but they will also reflect that these creations of skill and labor were the monuments which represented the patience, industry, and perseverance of devoted and patriotic citizens."

An Ode

By Benjamin Sledd

[Read on Armistice Day, 1921, at the dedication of the Memorial to Wake Forest students fallen in the Great War[1]]

America, on this proud day,
Thy loyal children, we
With lips and heart would pay
Tribute of love and homage unto thee.

Peace, Peace! with victory
Of Honour and of Right
Over old Wrong and Tyranny
New-risen in this primal, brutal night.

Peace, peace, with more than victory!
For now, America, at last
Those years of difference they are past:
Peace between thee
And thine own kin beyond the sea;
Brothers, henceforth are we
Thrice strong with strength of unity;
Fearless to reach a brother hand
To raise the fallen in whatsoever land,
To right the wrong wherever wrong may be.

America, on this proud day,
While many a land, at last made free
From time-long tyranny,
With lips and heart shall pay
Tribute of homage unto thee,—
While on the waiting Mother's breast
Her Unknown Soldier Dead is laid to rest,—
Here, where they walked in life, we come to raise
A votive stone and speak the praise
Of our own dead. Their all they gave
The cause of all, when all seemed lost, to save.
Was it too great, the price they paid?

(1) Doctor Sledd read this poem at the conclusion of his interesting lecture on North Carolina poets.—Ed.

What price had been too great?—
Once to have freed all Europe from the weight
Of nightmare years of armèd hate;
Forever to have laid
The spectre of the Red Right Hand
And Blazing Brand,
Still overshadowing sea and land:
To have made once more the patriot's word
In councils of the people heard;
And given the world a peace that saith
Nation with nation shall keep faith.

And he, our Chieftain and our guide,
Lying stricken today by the Potomac side,
His hour of triumph still denied;
Shall we the tardy years await
To show all honor to the man,
So sternly just, so singly great,
So brave to bear the hand of Fate?
And shall it fail, the goodliest plan
That patient-striving wisdom can?
Or shall it be the dawning's tremulous ray
Broadening at last into the perfect day
Of peace on earth, goodwill to men?

Peace, peace again!
Not builded for To-day upon the sand
But reared with patience, toil and pain;
Broad-based, deep-founded, fitted to withstand
To-morrow's stress and strain,
When blow the winds and falls the rain:
Peace, peace, by land and sea,
With more than Peace to be!

North Carolina Bibliography, (1920-1921)

By Mary B. Palmer
Secretary North Carolina Library Commission

This Bibliography covers the period from November 20, 1920 to November 1, 1921.

The term Bibliography is here used to include the works of all native North Carolinians, regardless of present residence, and the works of writers who, although not born in North Carolina, have lived here long enough to become identified with the state. Pamphlets, continuations, and periodical articles are not included.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

Abbreviations and Symbols: c., copyright; il., illustrated; p., pages; v., volume. The capital letters, D. O. Q. S. T. F., refer to the size of the books.

Bacon, William James, ed. History of the Fifty-fifth field artillery brigade. 1917, 1918, 1919. F.335p. il. The author, Goodbar bldg., Memphis, Tenn., 1920. $6.00.

The history of the 55th F. A. brigade proper as used in this volume was prepared by Walter Chandler; the 105th Ammunition train by W. W. Lewis; the 113th F. A. by Arthur L. Fletcher.

Bassett, John Spencer. Short history of the United States, 1492-1920. O.942p. il. Macmillan, 1921. $3.90.

Bost, Mrs. Emma, (Ingold). Songs in many keys. O.80p. il. The author, 740 10th Ave., Hickory, N. C., 1920. $1.25.

Brooks, Eugene Clyde and Carmichael, W. D. North Carolina. O.32p. il. Rand, 1921. 65c.

Gibson, Julia Amanda and Mathews, Maud Craig. Lineage and tradition of the family of John Springs III, ed. by and cover and title designed by Maude Craig Mathews. O.418p. Foote and Davies Co., Atlanta, 1921.

Gilbert, Chester Garfield, and Pogue, J. E. America's power resources; the economic significance of coal, oil and water-power. D.326p. il. Century, 1921. $2.50.

Mr. Pogue is a North Carolinian.

Harper, William Allen. Reconstructing the church; an examination of the problems of the times from the standpoint of a layman of the church; introd. by F. Marion Lawrence. D.188p. Revell, 1920. $1.25.

Hulse, E. G. History of the great world war . . . illustrated with photographic reproductions of the men from Granville county who took part in this unparalleled conflict. Q.214p. il. Oxford Orphanage, Oxford, N. C., 1920.

Jones, Gilmer Andrew. Jones quizzer, consisting of North Carolina Supreme Court questions and answers from September term, 1898 to August term, 1920. 2d ed. O.280p. The author, Franklin, N. C., 1921. $5.00.

Kirkland, Winifred Margaretta. Christmas shrine; or, the makers of peace. S.30p. Womans Press, 1920. 85c.

Koch, Frederick Henry. Raleigh, the Shepherd of the Ocean, designed to commemorate the tercentenary of the execution of Sir Walter Raleigh, with a foreword by Edwin Greenlaw. O.95p. il. Raleigh Woman's Club, Raleigh, N. C., 1920. $2.50.

Morehead, John Motley. The Morehead family of North Carolina and Virginia. F.147p. il. Priv. printed DeVinne Press, 1921.

North Carolina Sorosis. A pageant of the lower Cape Fear written in collaboration by citizens of Wilmington in North Carolina, with the supervision of Frederick Henry Koch. O.130p. il. Wilmington Printing Company, Wilmington, N. C., 1921. $2.50.

Pell, Edward Leigh. What did Jesus really teach about prayer? D.203p. il. Revell, 1921. $1.50.

Price, Natalie Whitted. Sketches in lyric prose and verse. O.80p. bds. Seymour, 1920. $2.00.

Saunders, William O. Concept of life and other Saunders editorials: being some editorials and epigrams as written from time to time by W. O. Saunders himself and now gathered into a book and printed in the shop of the Independent. O.68p. The author, Elizabeth City, N. C., 1921. 60c.

Scherer, James Augustin Brown. Tree of light. D.125p. il. Crowell, 1921. $1.35.

Smith, Charles Alphonso. O. Henry. O.40p. Martin and Hoyt Co., Atlanta, 1921. 40c.

SMITH, HENRY LOUIS. Your biggest job, school or business: some words of counsel for red-blooded young Americans who are getting tired of school. D.79p. Appleton, 1920. $1.00.

STEPHENSON, GILBERT T. The business relation between God and man a trusteeship. D.112p. Sunday School Board, Southern Baptist Convention, 1921.

TURNER, JOSEPH KELLY and BRIDGERS, JOHN LUTHER. History of Edgecombe county, North Carolina. O.486p. il. The author, Rocky Mount, N. C., 1920. $5.00.

WILLIAMS, CHARLES BURGESS and HILL, DANIEL HARVEY. Corn book for young folk. D.250p. il. Ginn, 1920. $1.20.

The Historian and the Daily Press

By Gerald W. Johnson

Associate Editor of the Greensboro Daily News

What is a historian? Webster answers, "A writer of history; a chronicler; an annalist." If that definition were exhaustive, I should have no subject; for the chronicling of events, the notation of dates and characters in the drama of the world, is but the routine of my own craft. The newspaper is the greatest of annalists, and if the historian were no more, then historian and daily press would be one. But if history is more than merely the repository of facts, even of carefully adjusted and correlated facts, the historian must be more than a sublimated newspaper reporter. The technical definition is not exhaustive.

Nor is the popular definition appreciably more encouraging. It varies with the populace, of course, but in North Carolina I do not believe that I am satirizing it in giving it utterance as follows: a man whose memory is a storehouse of irrelevant information, a man who can tell you the date of the battle of Fontenoy, or when Richard Dobbs Spaight died, but whose interest in the activities of the human race includes none more recent than those of, say, the year 1870; except, perhaps, that the more active and inquiring minds among them may have brought their catalogue of exciting events down as far as November 11, 1918. In short, the popular conception of a historian is that of a man who deals definitely, and exclusively, with the past. Popular definitions are rarely, if ever, without some foundation in fact; I leave it to you to determine how much basis of fact there is in this one.

But it is not exhaustive. If it were, I should still have no subject, for the newspaper's is the most ephemeral existence imaginable. Nothing is deader than yesterday's newspaper. Nothing is more remote than its relation to things that pertain exclusively to the past. Its preoccupation is with today; and until the historian projects himself and his science into today's affairs, his professional relation to the daily press is non-existent.

Not that the daily press has any objection to historical material in itself. The freshness of a news story, generally speaking, constitutes its chief newspaper value. But that is not its only value; and when its other qualifications are sufficiently high, age, contrary to the general impression, will not bar it. It used to be said that President Roosevelt

could, and did, restate the Ten Commandments in such novel and striking form that every newspaper in the country printed them. But that was Roosevelt, not the Decalogue. Mr. W. T. Bost once wrote a story of a congressional convention that had occurred, not the previous day, but four years before; and the story was so good that the Greensboro Daily News printed it on the front page. The value of that story lay in its superlatively fine reporting. A historian who can speak like Mr. Roosevelt, or write like Mr. Bost, could no doubt turn in an account of the battle of Gettysburg, and get it printed. But his relation to the newspapers would be that of a clever publicist, not that of a historian. And it is the historian and the daily press that this paper is supposed to discuss.

If there is no intimate and mutually profitable relation between them, it must be because neither historians nor daily newspapers have reached the ideal toward which both should strive. That ideal, I take it, is the position of an expositor to the public of the truth about men and events which the average man is not in position to observe for himself. Time and space are the deterrents of humanity's acquirements of all knowledge; it is the historian's business to reduce the handicap of time; it is the newspaper's business to reduce that of space. Their common object is, immediately, to furnish men with accurate information in order that, ultimately, men may know the truth which will make them free. So, in the final analysis, the historian who is true to his science, and the newspaper that is true to its pretensions, pursue a common ideal—the discovery, and the transmission to others, of as much of the truth as it is humanly possible to apprehend.

Therefore, no matter how far apart their starting points, since they work toward a single goal it is a logical necessity that their paths should converge. The point of contact is reached when the incident of the day, which it is the newspaper's business to handle, cannot be interpreted aright except in the light of something that has gone before, something that lies in the province of the historian. Then, if the people are to know the truth, the historian's special knowledge must buttress the journalist's general information. Then the profession and the trade supplement each other to admiration—the newspaper man has the fact, the historian has the knowledge to illuminate it. By their joint effort, and only by their joint effort, can they set it forth to the world in its true relations, can they make men estimate it at its true value.

But immediately the question arises as to the necessity of the historian's dependence upon the newspapers. Granting the importance of the historian's special knowledge in these critical times, and granting

the imperiousness of his summons to place his knowledge at the service of his country, one may still inquire, why should he resort to the columns of the daily press? Why should he not adhere to the time-honored method of inclosing his information in books?

The answer is obvious: because it is the age of democracy, and the daily press alone has the ear of DEMOS. Did our national policies depend upon the will of a small class, a leisurely and cultured class, such as actually ruled the country far into the nineteenth century, it might be feasible to reach them with books and reach them in time. But the fate of the nation no longer rests in the hands of studious and cultured gentlemen. It is directed by the will of the multitude, swayed by the passions of the multitude, and may be wrecked by the mistakes of the multitude. Information, to be of value to the nation, must be imparted to the multitude; and therefore it must come through the channels that reach the multitude, or come not at all. The daily press furnishes the only reading matter of enough people to swing the balance in any election. Therefore it is only through the daily press that the historian can reach the people, and reach them promptly.

Moreover, how many books could be produced if North Carolina were their sole market? Yet North Carolina, no less than the nation, has need of the services of some of you. North Carolina, also, is in a transitional period. She is changing her status and her whole outlook on life swiftly, almost suddenly. Therefore she is confronted with new problems that yet are in some measure old; and she needs desperately a true historical perspective if she is to understand them; and understand them she must, if she is to deal with them competently, and thereby clear the way to the leadership that appears now to be in sight.

Leadership is to be achieved by people who make mistakes, else none of us ever could qualify. But it is rarely, and with immense difficulty, to be achieved by people who make the same mistake twice. And how is the repetition of errors to be avoided by a people that is uninformed, or misinformed, as to the mistakes it has made in the past?

One of the thankless tasks that devolves upon you, as keepers of the records of the past, is the duty of warning the present generation lest it walk into ancient pitfalls. But if we must occasionally drag into the light of day the mistakes of our fathers, surely it is better to do it in the columns of a daily newspaper, that passes into oblivion with the rising of tomorrow's sun, than in the permanence of a book. If the warning is to serve for today, it must be spread where it will be read today; and if the display passes with the need of it, so much the better.

I should like much to see a series of articles by some historian of repute, analyzing the effects today of a certain characteristic that has been prominent in the record of North Carolina since the history of the state began. I refer to its astonishing self-sufficiency, as reflected in its political philosophy. The independence of North Carolina, its stiff refusal to bow the neck to any exterior power whatsoever, has brought us many, and enduring, glories—but it also brought us Appomatox. Who believes that the northern armies could have endured the series of disasters that marked the first two years of the war had they not been nerved to fresh efforts by the thought that they were fighting the institution of human slavery? Our refusal to accept the moral judgment of the rest of the nation against that abomination was at last the cause of our downfall—a downfall that utter devotion and immortal valor could postpone, but could not avert. That valor and that devotion are worthy of honor and praise, and we do well to dwell upon them; but is there less significance in the singularly blind determination to run our own affairs in our own way that caused them to be spent in vain?

That valor and devotion may be part of our heritage from our fathers, but that determination certainly is. Twice within recent years North Carolina interests have upset federal legislation governing child labor, less because North Carolinians are resolved to feed their children to the Moloch of industrialism than because they resent the interference of Congress with their business affairs. Is not this independence run to seed? North Carolina is rapidly becoming an industrial state, but it has as yet no effective workmen's compensation law, because manufacturers dislike state interference in their business; and that in the face of the fact that the most enlightened industrial communities long ago agreed that the risks of industry ought not to be borne by labor alone. Our boasted independence is once more bringing us into collision with the moral judgment of the nation. On the question of schools, on the question of roads, most conspicuously on the question of taxation, the cry of "county self-government" is being raised. Yet in all these things the counties have been tried and it has been proved that they are incapable of acting with wisdom and energy. "License they mean when they cry liberty."

What better service could a historian render North Carolina today than to attack and demolish this false independence, this much touted spirit of liberty which is really the spirit of obscurantism? "Your goodness," said Emerson, "must have some edge to it, else it is none." Put an edge to your history, gentlemen, an edge that will cut away the weeds of vanity and bombast that have overgrown our minds. Tip the

spearhead of your history with the point of a modern fact, and you have a weapon that the daily press never can resist the temptation to wield. And what dragons of error you might be the means of slaying, what dangers you might be the means of removing from the path of this state, no imagination is able to guess.

I have purposely touched upon the distasteful side of the historian's duty, as I see it, because that is the side ordinarily glossed over. There is small need to emphasize the pleasanter side of your work, for surely you must know that the daily press would be gratified to be allowed to assist you in your function as conservators of the accumulated wisdom of the past and custodians of the glories that our fathers won. I wish to assure you that we recognize also our duty to assist when it is necessary to exhibit the skeletons, and not the crowns.

For we are engaged alike in the hopeless quest. You are a learned society, and I the representative of a guild; but we both seek for the answer to the question Pilate asked Omniscience, and asked in vain: "What is truth?" We shall not find the answer in its entirety, but we may approach it if we seek diligently. But we must face all that we discover, whether it seems to us evil or good, for only as we tell her honestly and candidly all that we have found can we hope to help North Carolina to climb that long ascent that it is our pride to believe will eventually lead her among the stars.

An Old Time North Carolina Election

By Louise Irby

Associate Professor of History, North Carolina College for Women

"Then none was for a party;
Then all were for the State;
Then the great man helped the poor,
And the poor man loved the great."

Thus the poet makes the old Roman lament the decadence of his own times in contrast with "the brave days of old." Such a lament is common to every generation, each of which looks back to the generations of the past as superior to itself. It is human to magnify the faults of those nearest to us and to laud the virtues of those from whom we are separated by great stretches of time or space. Yet when we really find out the conditions in the past, we learn that many of those whose records are brightest often took part in proceedings that would be condemned by our standards of today. For instance, no matter how democratic we may proclaim our country to have been in the past, we find everywhere a cleavage based on wealth, family, or some other artificial distinction. It has been aptly said that a statesman is a dead politician. So, too, the term "politician" with a slurring import is often used of one who in the future may be referred to as a great statesman.

I am going to tell the story of an election in which some of the most eminent of the early statesmen of North Carolina resorted to tactics which would arouse the moral indignation of a present-day Tammany politician. The story is well worth the telling for it involves not only some of the greatest names in the history of North Carolina, but what is of more interest, it concerns the most important political campaign in the history of the American people, viz., the campaign of 1788 for the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. The campaign in North Carolina aroused bitter class-feeling which put to shame the boasted democracy of our "Revolutionary Fathers." The "Esquires" and the "Common People" lined up against each other in solid phalanxes which soon crystallized into real political parties.

The Convention held in Philadelphia in 1787 for the purpose of preparing a new form of government for the United States, after completing its work, adopted a resolution expressing the opinion that Congress should submit the Constitution to a convention of delegates in each state, chosen by the people thereof, "under the recommendation of

its Legislature." A copy of the proposed Constitution, accompanied by an open letter from Washington, president of the Convention, was sent to the legislatures through the governors of the several states. Immediately the advocates and the opponents of the new scheme of government marshalled their forces for the contest under the names of Federalists and Anti-Federalists. Then, for the first time in our history, appeared the germs of our modern political parties. In the campaign that followed party animosity and personal bitterness raged more furiously than ever before or since in our history, except, perhaps, in the great campaign involving the issues of slavery and freedom.

The campaign in North Carolina was no exception to this general rule. Governor Caswell submitted the new Constitution to the General Assembly on November 21, 1787. The two houses in joint session named the last Friday and Saturday in March, 1788 as the time for the choice of delegates to attend a state convention for the purpose of deliberating on the Constitution. Freemen who had paid public taxes could vote in the election, but only freeholders were eligible to sit in the Convention. Each of the fifty-eight counties was entitled to have five delegates, each of the six borough towns one, and the election was to be held under the same rules as regular elections for members of the General Assembly. The delegates elected were to assemble in Convention at Hillsborough July 21, 1788. The public printer was ordered to print 1500 copies of the Constitution to be dispersed by the members of the Assembly among their constituents.

The campaign was conducted with great violence. At the sessions of the courts, at county militia musters, in the taverns, wherever men gathered, the main topics of conversation were the Constitution and its framers. Arguments were advanced pro and con in letters, in pamphlets, in communications to the newspapers, and in public addresses. The progress of sentiment in other states was eagerly followed. Advocates of the Constitution focussed attention on the beneficial results that would follow adoption; their opponents pointed out many defects in the plan drawn up at Philadelphia. In the heat of argument no man's character was above attack and no past political or military service could overcome party animosity. Thomas Person, a general of the Revolution and a patriot of undoubted sincerity, denounced Washington as "a damned rascal and traitor to his country for putting his hand to such an infamous paper as the new Constitution." Willie Jones, leader of the Anti-Federalists, found it necessary to deny in the public press that he had "called the Members of the Grand Convention, generally, and General Washington and Col. Davie, in particular, scoun-

drels," and asserted that he thought Washington "the first and best character in the world" and Davie "a valuable member of the community." William Hooper, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, tried in vain for a seat in the Convention. Other men as distinguished as he met a similar fate. Among those who were thus rejected was no less a leader than Richard Caswell, whose defeat in Dobbs county was the climax of the campaign.

In 1788 the present counties of Lenoir, Greene and Wayne comprised Dobbs County with Kinston as the county seat. When the election was called to elect delegates to the Convention at Hillsborough, interest in the new form of government had reached its height. Copies of the Constitution had been scattered over the country printed on broadsides and in newspapers, so the people had had the opportunity to be well-informed as to the issues involved. Those who could not read or could not understand the provisions of the document listened eagerly to others discourse upon it and later passed on the arguments they had heard. Six states had already ratified, so there was strong probability that the new plan would go into effect. Most of the men of wealth, education, and social and political prominence in the county were for the adoption of the Constitution. The majority of the people, however, were loth to accept any change in the form of government.

Among the Federalist candidates, first and foremost was Richard Caswell, who would surely reflect honor on any gathering. He was not only one of the leading men of the state at that time, but he is one of the most prominent men in the entire history of North Carolina. Coming to North Carolina from Maryland as a young man, he started on a career that extended over forty years of public life, during which time he was accorded almost every honor that the state could bestow. He was speaker of the Assembly, colonial treasurer, delegate to the Continental Congress, president of the Provincial Congress, and president of the Constitutional Convention of 1776 which adopted the State Constitution; he took a prominent part in military affairs, serving against the Regulators at Alamance, against the Highlanders at Moore's Creek Bridge, and with Gates in his disastrous campaign against Cornwallis which at Camden ended in the worst defeat ever sustained by an American army. Largely due to his military fame, he was chosen the first governor of North Carolina after independence was declared, and was reelected six times. Such was the man who wished to serve his state in the Convention that was to decide the future relations of North

Carolina to the union, but who was defeated by candidates whose sole claim to fame is that they were Caswell's opponents in the election. In the sketch of Caswell in the Biographical History of North Carolina, it is stated that it was largely through his influence that North Carolina rejected the Federal Constitution as it was first presented. This statement is no doubt founded on Caswell's refusal to serve in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia. The explanation that Caswell himself made for declining to attend the Convention was that "from my bad state of health about the time appointed for the meeting of the Convention it was impracticable for me to attend." His subsequent course toward the Constitution leaves us no room to doubt that this was his real reason. In the account of the election which I am going to relate, I shall show not only that Caswell ran on the Federalist ticket, but also that his supporters were willing to use any means to have him seated in the Convention that was to consider the Constitution.

With Caswell, there was his brother-in-law, John Herritage, on whose family estate the town of Kinston had been laid out. He was a man of influence in the county, having served as commissioner for erecting the county buildings, and along with Caswell was a trustee of Dobbs Academy, and "trustee and director" of the town of Kinston. Almost rivaling Caswell in prominence was James Glasgow, who had served as Secretary of State since 1777. In the Revolutionary period he had served as assistant secretary of the Provincial Congress and secretary of the Council of Safety. Later he was on the committee to state the Revolutionary accounts of North Carolina with the United States and was clerk to the claims committee. He also served the county in various ways. The other two Federalist candidates, Bryan Whitfield and Benjamin Sheppard, had held important positions in both the county and the state. Since Dobbs county was formed in 1760 Richard Caswell had represented it in fifteen of the twenty-four general assemblies, and during each of the last eight years one or more of these Federalist candidates had represented the county as senator or as commoner. It would have been hard, indeed, to find men of better training and experience to help North Carolina determine her attitude toward the new Constitution.

In spite of their varied careers in politics, however, the Federalist candidates in Dobbs county displayed less political sagacity than their more inexperienced opponents. They failed to realize the necessity of presenting a solid front, but allowed some of their none-too-numerous

supporters to fritter away part of their strength by casting a few merely complimentary votes for men closely allied with them by family. No such over-confidence prevailed in the Anti-Federalist campaign. They presented only five candidates and lined up behind them in solid array. Whereas Richard Caswell and James Glasgow received twenty-two more votes than John Herritage, there was a difference of only five between the votes of the highest and the lowest Anti-Federalist candidates. The practically solid Anti-Federalist vote went for Moses Westbrook, Jacob Johnson, Isaac Croom, Absalom Price, and Abraham Baker. So far as I have been able to find in the records, these men were with no political experience with the one exception of Moses Westbrook, who had represented the county one term in the House of Commons. The voters of Dobbs county were to choose between men who for years had held prominent positions in the state and others who, if they had ability, had not had the opportunity to display it.

Benjamin Caswell, sheriff of Dobbs county, feeling the great responsibility resting upon him, took every precaution to have a fair election. The box used to receive the votes, being originally meant to receive the votes for the Senate and the House of Commons, was divided into two receptacles, each with a separate lid, one for receiving the votes for senator, the other for receiving the votes for commoners. During the voting for delegates to the Convention, all the ballots were put in one side, the other side being sealed. Ordinarily each ballot as it was counted was torn in two and thrown away, but to insure a fair count in the present election Sheriff Caswell arranged to have the ballots preserved after being counted and deposited in the vacant side of the ballot box. Thus they would be ready for a recount in the event of a disputed election.

On Saturday evening after the ballotting had closed, the poorly ventilated, dimly lighted court-room was half-filled with men anxiously watching the counting of the votes. As each name was called out and recorded, speculation as to the outcome rose to a high pitch. Desultory conversation ceased and those present gathered more closely around the group recording the votes. Frederick Baker, probably a brother of Candidate Baker, was holding a candle near the table eagerly watching the returns. To the delight of the Anti-Federalists the election was going in favor of their candidates, and as name after name was called out, there could be no doubt as to the outcome. The total number of

ballots cast was 372, each elector voting for five candidates; the counting of the first 282 showed the following results:

FEDERALISTS

Richard Caswell, ...120
James Glasgow, ...120
Benjamin Sheppard, ...110
Bryan Whitfield, ...106
John Herritage, ... 98

ANTI-FEDERALISTS

Moses Westbrook, ...159
Jacob Johnson, ...158
Isaac Croom, ...157
Absalom Price, ...156
Abraham Baker 154

In addition to these there were a few scattering Federalist votes.

The Federalists were deeply chagrined. Was it possible that Richard Caswell, ex-governor, and James Glasgow, even then the Secretary of State, could be defeated by such obscure and inexperienced men? The very thought made them blush for their county! "Poor Dobbs, Poor Dobbs," they moaned as they moved here and there among the crowd, "Preacher Baker before Governor Caswell!" They decried the character and ability of their successful opponents and cursed the folly of the people. The Anti-Federalists, of course, did not tamely submit to these insults. Caswell and Glasgow, no doubt, had done good service, but their efforts would not be called for in this case. There would be others to represent Dobbs county at Hillsborough. Their air of confidence roiled the supporters of the losing candidates, who began to utter threats. Feeling rose to fever heat. But the Federalist leaders realized that the crisis called for something more than futile lamentations and unexecuted threats. Action—prompt, bold, decisive—alone could save the day, and action was quickly agreed upon. Loudly declaring that Neall Hopkins, one of the inspectors of the election, was showing too much interest in the results, an angry Federalist strode up to the bench on which sat the ballot box, and threatened him with blows, and, as simultaneously another Federalist struck the candle from Frederick Baker's hand, Inspector Hopkins prudently hastened to seek safety through an open window. Instantly all the other candles were knocked over, and the room was left in utter darkness.

For a moment the startled crowd was quiet. Then, suddenly, pandemonium broke loose. The sound of curses and blows was heard above the uproar. Sheriff Caswell, endeavoring to guard the ballot-box, was

knocked almost senseless, and the box was forcibly and violently wrenched from him and carried away. Thereupon Benjamin Sheppard, one of the Federalist candidates, turning to his supporters, exclaimed, "Well done, Boys, now we'll have a new Election!"

The morning after the riot, the ballot box was found near the jail, broken to pieces with the tickets scattered around it on the ground. Curiosity led many people to the place to see the remains of the evidence that might have elected Anti-Federalists to seats in the State Convention. Robert White declared that he picked up "a number of Scrolls or Tickets which appeared to be done up in the Manner they Commonly are when put in the box;" and that of the sixty-three scrolls that he examined sixty-two had the names of Johnson, Baker, Westbrook, Price and Croom written on them. But Charles Markland Jr., passing the jail, saw the remains of the box and the tickets, some of which were open and the others rolled up. He collected as many as he conveniently could and carried them to Luther Spalding's tavern, where he observed to Spalding that there seemed to be more tickets for the Federalist candidates than for the others. Spalding upon counting some of the votes remarked that if the election had been broken up by members of the Federalist party they did wrong, for it seeemd from the uncounted ballots that the Federalist candidates would have been elected.

The Federalists had prevented the success of their opponents, but that was not sufficient,—they must have Federalist delegates to represent the county. Accordingly they appealed to Samuel Johnston, the Federalist governor, to order a new election. Johnston promptly complied with the request, but, doubtful of his authority in the matter, merely "recommended" to the sheriff to hold another election. The reason he gave in his order to the sheriff was that "it hath been made appear to me that the Ballots taken by you at the late General Election for Delegates to the State Convention, were forceably & violently seized and taken from you by some riotous and disorderly persons, so that you had it not in your power to ascertain who were the persons who had the greatest number of Votes, and therefore cannot make a Return of any Persons as duly elected to serve as delegates in the said Convention." The Governor also said that "a number of respectable Inhabitants of the said county have by Petition, represented to me, that the Inhabitants of the said County are desirous that I should appoint another Day for the purpose of electing Delegates to represent them in the said Convention.

"I do therefore recommend to such of the Inhabitants of Dobbs County aforesaid, as are entitled to vote for Representatives in the house of Commons to meet at the Court House of the said County on

the fourteenth & fifteenth days of July next, then and there to elect five Freeholders to represent them in the State Convention to be held at the Town of Hillsborough on the third Monday in July next; and I do hereby require you to give notice to the Inhabitants to meet accordingly, and that you attend at the same time & place and conduct the said Election in the manner prescribed by the Resolve of the last General Assembly held at Tarborough."

The sheriff accordingly held the election as "recommended" by His Excellency. No cognizance was taken of the identity of the "riotous and disorderly persons" who had broken up the former election, and how many of the "respectable inhabitants" really desired such a new election may be inferred from the number who took part in it. Whereas 372 votes were cast in the March election, only 85 were cast in the July election, all the Anti-Federalists, for fear of countenancing an illegal procedure, remaining away from the polls. Accordingly, Federalist candidates were chosen without opposition and Richard Caswell, James Glasgow, Winston Caswell, Benjamin Sheppard, and Nathan Lassiter were given certificates of election.

When the Convention convened at Hillsborough July 21, these five Federalists appeared to take their seats. A strong protest against seating them was presented by the Anti-Federalists of Dobbs county. Upon the motion of William Lenoir of Wilkes County, which was seconded by Thomas Person of Granville, the returns for Dobbs county were read. Lenoir then presented a petition signed by 248 men. A number of these men, not being able to write, made their marks. They protested against the means used by 85 men of the county to send Federalist delegates to the Convention. In the petition they stated how the first election had been broken up by a riot because it was apparent that the Anti-Federalist candidates would be elected, and how the Federalists had induced the Governor to grant a new election. The petitioners claimed that the Governor had exceeded his power in calling a second election and asked that Johnson, Baker, Westbrook, Price and Croom be seated in the Convention.

Richard Dobbs Spaight of Craven presented the deposition of Sheriff Benjamin Caswell, in which he stated what had taken place at the March election, together with a poll of the election so that the Convention would have the basis for judging the result. Spaight also presented the depositions of William Croom, Neall Hopkins, Robert White, John Hartsfield, Job Smith and Frederick Baker, giving the details of the election, the riot, and the tickets that were found the next morning. Stephen Cabarrus of Chowan presented the depositions of Charles Mark-

land, Jr., and Luther Spalding in regard to the votes that were picked up the day after the election, upholding the contentions of the Federalists.

The petition and the various depositions were referred to the committee of elections which was composed of eleven Federalists and sixteen Anti-Federalists. Among them were Samuel Spencer, David Caldwell, Thomas Person, William R. Davie, Isaac Gregory, James Iredell, Stephen Cabarrus, and Archibald Maclaine. On July 23, Gregory presented to the Convention the report of the committee, which recommended "that the sitting members returned from the county of Dobbs vacate their seats, as it does not appear that a majority of the county approved of a new election under the recommendation of his excellency the governor, but the contrary is more probable." On the petition of the Anti-Federalists that their candidates be seated, the committee reported that, because of the riot at the March election, "the sheriff could have made no return of any five members elected, nor was there any evidence before the committee by which they could determine with certainty, which candidates had a majority of the votes of the other electors. The committee was therefore of opinion, that the first election is void as well as the latter."

To this report the Convention agreed. Dobbs county, consequently, was unrepresented in the North Carolina Convention that first considered the Federal Constitution and two of the foremost citizens of the state were unseated. The Federalists of Dobbs County had been able to keep their opponents from the Convention but not to seat their own candidates. The result, however, had no effect upon the deliberations of the Convention, which refused to ratify the new Constitution by a majority of 184 to 84. Accordingly, when George Washington was inaugurated President of the United States, the newspapers of the time listed North Carolina as a "foreign state." The epithet was unpalatable to her people and before the year was out they called a second convention which re-instated North Carolina to her rightful place in the sisterhood of states.

SOURCES.—The sources consulted in the preparation of this essay are: State Records of North Carolina, Vols. XI-XXV; the original depositions, petitions, etc., filed in "The Papers of the Convention of 1788" (Collections of the North Carolina Historical Commission); photostat copies of contemporaneous North Carolina newspapers in the collections of the North Carolina Historical Commission; the Charles E. Johnson Manuscripts (Collections of the North Carolina Historical Commission); McRee, Griffith J.,

"The Life and Correspondence of James Iredell"; Elliot's "Debates on the Federal Constitution, 1787-88"; Ashe, S. A. (editor) "Biographical History of North Carolina," 8 vols.; Connor, R. D. W. (compiler) "North Carolina Manual, 1913"; Connor, H. G., "The Conventions of 1788 and 1789 and the Federal Constitution," (North Carolina Booklet, Vol. IV. No. 4); Battle, Kemp, P., "Trial of James Glasgow and the Supreme Court of North Carolina," (North Carolina Booklet, Vol. III. No. 1); Connor, R. D. W., "History of North Carolina—Colonial and Revolutionary Periods"; Boyd, W. K., "History of North Carolina—The Federal Period"; Ashe, S. A., "History of North Carolina," Vol. I; Wagstaff, H. M., "Federalism in North Carolina" (James Sprunt Historical Publications, Vol. 9, No. 2), and "William Richardson Davie and Federalism in North Carolina" (Bulletin 28, Publications N. C. Historical Commission.).

Raleigh and Roanoke

By John Jordan Douglass.

Knight of famed Albion's Golden Age,
When Shakespeare sang his deathless song,
Bright shines thy name upon the page
Amid the crowned immortal throng:
Statesman, soldier, patron of the sea,
Fain would I touch my humble harp to thee!

Clear-visioned like the great Genoese,
No seas thy conquering courage tombed;
Faith gave thee thrice her magic keys
To ope the gates where freedom bloomed
On land remote from courts and kings,
Wide-measured by the eagle's wings.

Sea-King, who watched the red-speared dawns
Break through nights' nubian bands,
Who played with death with ships as pawns
Held in the sea's blue hands.
Thy spirit sought the western star,
Where gleamed the sunset's golden bar.

Sea-seer whose ships sailed to our land
Ere, 'mid New England's snows,
Was kindled by the Pilgrim's hand
Freedom's watch-fire that still glows,
We come in varied walks and ways
To sing thy noble praise.

Saw there in vision this great State,
Beyond the isle which, like a rose,
Blooms fair beside the sea's green gate
Through which the blue tide comes and goes—
Roanoke, that sparkling emerald gem
In Neptune's diadem!

Was it thy province to behold,
As seer and prophet oft times see,
A land of freemen, leal and bold,
To thrill the world with Liberty—
A State whose patriots first arose
Near where the red Catawba flows!

Who first in Mecklenburg declared
The Western world, by right, was free—
Who boldly signed their names, and dared
To question tyranny!
Ere Freedom's Excalibur, bright and keen,
Flashed in the hands of Greene!

Mayhap, thine was the prophet's gaze
Beyond the tawdry gild of thrones,
Where 'mid Roanoke's moss-tangled maze,
Rose Freedom's altar stones;
Roanoke, harp of the singing sea
That chants thy threnody.

White-winged thy ships, like wild birds, fared
Across the sea to far Roanoke;
Of thee who dreamed, and, dreaming, dared
The Wonder of the New World broke;
There on the balmy, breeze-swept shore
The New World's open door.

Roanoke, where once the red man roamed,
In stoic solitude,
And built near where the wild sea foamed
His wigwam strange and crude:
The first to feel the white man's tread,
To shroud his stern, heroic dead.

To thee sailed ships one memoried day,
Like weird unearthly birds,
They rode thy placid sheltered bay,
Whose bright blue border girds
The wave-kissed shore whose stately trees
Call to the wandering gypsy breeze.

The eagle, perched on lofty crest,
Looked down with restless eye,
Screamed to the fledglings in her nest
And sought the cloud plumed sky,
Strong-winged, majestic, meant to be
The symbol of the free!

The brown doe, startled at her drink,
Turned toward the tangled brake,
Shot like an arrow from the brink
Where lay the lilied lake;
And with her fawn far coverts sought,
In shadowy silence deeper wrought.

The night-hawk warned her wandering mate
High in a ghostly oak;
And silence like some spell of fate
Lay deep upon Roanoke.
Where stretched the shimmering strand of gold
The New World met the storied old.

High sailed the moon, the Night's corsair;
In anchored calm the strange ships rode;
The sails close-reefed; the mast-poles bare;
The sea-wind sang its solemn ode:
'Neath starry skies the New World slept,
Its fierce wild cries unleashed, unkept.

No more would maids of Manteo
In dark-eyed splendor reign alone;
Soon would the face, white like the snow,
Call all the origin wild its own:
Soon, soon, the red rose droop and die;
Ne'er with the conquering lily vie!

By ebon pool, in sylvan glade,
Etched with the gold of filtered light,
Once dreamed the graceful Indian maid
Till day flowed purple into night,
And o'er the gray sea, hedged with gloom,
Saw dawn's first roses bloom.

Near by the sea a camp-fire burned,
Its lambent streamers leaping high;
And then a dusky maiden turned
As turns the brown doe's startled eye;
Clung like a wild vine close to him,
Whose stoic silence mocked her whim.

The light of doom: no more she gazed
Within the cypress-shadowed stream,
But like a wild thing, hushed, amazed,
Passed like the wan moon's sickly gleam,
When 'gainst the sky the smoke-plumes tower:
So passed the woodland's wild red flower.

The red man's feet would seek the west
His soul to savage lyres attuned;
Born in his heart a deep unrest
Called where the wandering west wind crooned:
No more his wild, weird cry was flung;
The Iliad of his doom was sung.

And if the march of man were o'er
When world had answered call of world,
The thunderous waves broke on that shore
In sparkling splendor, glittering, pearled,
Up from the sea, the bay's blue marge
Roanoke rose like a fairy barge.

Roanoke, scene of historic years,
Long gone with silent tread
With him who dreamed in hemispheres,
And sought thy shores to wed:
Roanoke, lute by the lilting sea
That sings of the Lost Colony.

Here first the conquering white man came
To light faith's altar-fires;
Here carved that strange and mystic name
That even yet conspires
To guard the secret darkly laid
Beneath the woodland's slumberous shade.

Mock-birds from tree and scented vine
Poured, rippling liquid notes,
That thrilled the white man's ear like wine
Gold poured from golden throats:
And romance called with living lyre—
Land of the hearts' desire!

It was the troth of East and West,
A common sea between;
A fathomed deep whose throbbing breast
Shall ever intervene,
Lest e'er in time, an alien flood
Should cleave the white man's welded blood.

The eagle guards its wild waves here,
The lion keeps them there,
And France with golden lilied spear
That pierced the world's despair;
And Italy, proud, historic Rome,
The Caesar's regal home.

Roanoke, fair isle we love the best,
Clasped in the sea's blue arms,
Rare pearl upon the ocean's breast
With sweet and lingering charms,
How oft our thoughts go wandering there
Back to the babe Virginia Dare!

We count it well that here was born
The first white child upon our shore,
Where love and honor still adorn,
The brow of woman, as of yore:
A sacred trust we shall defend
With chivalrous courage till the end.

Like him who spread his scarlet cloak
Lest his fair queen should touch the earth,
We spread our mantle on Roanoke
When this sweet baby had her birth,
The great seal of this sovereign State
Symbolic of our estimate.

Roanoke, stile at our Eastern door
Which first the white man knew,
Blue bay whose sparkling bosom bore
Sir Walter's gallant crew,
Thou wast the earnest of a state,
Wide-peopled, strong and great.

A state where Anglo-Saxons dwell,
The purest in this land,
Whose forbears wrested hill and dell
From out of the red man's hand,
And drove the ploughshare deep and wide
From sea to mountain side.

A people native to the soil
Unfettered, free from kings,
Where manhood, crowned with honest toil
To truth and honor clings:
A people, sturdy, seeking heights
Where burn the beacon-lights.

A people who e'en yet shall write
A new and nobler score
Which temples tower loft and white,
With wide and open door,
To every youth who dares to dream
Of learning's fathomed stream.

Brave, martyred soul, we greet thee here,
Thine is the hero's share;
Time carves thy name with jeweled tear,
Time carves it deep and fair.
Carolina holds in honor yet
Thy name with five score jewels set!

Well has our State in honor called
Her capital by thy name,
The name that England once enthralled,
But never steeped in shame:
O Raleigh, Carolina's chaliced love is thine;
Green as her princeliest long leaf pine.

Rich as the gems within her west,
Fair as her pearls in ocean's breast,
Sweet as her rarest full blown rose
To thee her cornucopia flows:
Captain, Conqueror, Prophet of the sea,
Carolina strikes her hundred harps to thee!

The Bread and Butter Aspect of North Carolina History

By D. D. Carroll
University of North Carolina

The industrial history of North Carolina waits to be written. Here and there are choice bits of clear and effective statement in the field of economic happening, but there is not that connected, comprehensive bringing together of vital facts in this realm which its importance merits, and without which our general interpretations will always be lame and halting. Indeed, our perception of trends and tendencies is dulled or is dangerously inaccurate without the stubborn, drab fact of economic circumstance. May I venture the opinion that, failing in this function of correctly detecting and indicating tendencies, the historian hazards his choicest contribution.

I would not be misunderstood. I do not hold communion with that school of economists or group of historians who believe that all human action can be reduced to the low level of stomach causation, that all that man has done or ever will do finds its ultimate and only explanation in the struggle for economic advantage. My appetite for philosophy almost persuades me at this point to spend my allotted time in pursuing this fascinating fallacy,—not so much to prove its variance from the truth, as to show how powerful it has been in determining the bent of progress when processes of change were gripping at the fundamentals of the social structure. Emerson's statement that "we are radicals before dinner and conservatives after dinner" certainly magnifies dinner as a potent force in shaping human history. And while it jars us somewhat to discover that a daring historian has, like a Don Quixote, charged at our Jeffersonian democracy with the poisoned lance of economic interpretation, it may make for ultimate truth in getting us to seek the source of the beauty of that fine flower of civic aspiration in the humus of earthy soil, as well as in the sunshine of political idealism.

At this time, it is particularly important, that more accurate and inclusive attention be given to the economic aspects of our life. During the past forty years, an Industrial Revolution has been going on in this commonwealth which rivals, if it does not exceed in rate and degree of change, that which brought to England a Pandora's box of problems. For half a century England groped and wrestled in darkness, before her historians diagnosed the real issues, and she was just beginning to understand and to deal accurately with them when the Great War came

on. It is not necessary to remind a gathering such as this, that it was largely the work of that fine group of economic historians and historical economists which revealed the true cause, nature, and extent of those problems. Perhaps all will admit that Britain has paid and will continue to pay dearly for not taking stock and keeping full records of her industrial life as the Revolution proceeded. May I venture the statement that at this moment *we* are immersed in an industrial transformation which is not only more rapid than that of England, but is carrying a twentieth century voltage. To continue this figure, the economic current in life has been stepped up to a voltage higher than our moral safety would probably justify, since selfish class interests grow deep and intense in its heat. But this makes it all the more important to keep the records full and the interpretations clear. To make for greater complication, just as our industrial life was emerging from adolescence into the steady and enduring stride of healthy, confident youth, it imbibed a dangerously large dose of the war profits intoxicant, which sent it lunging forward, in a blundering stagger, dangerous alike to itself and every other phase of life to which it is related. To our normal problems, and they would have been troublesome and complex enough, we must add just at this time the aggravations of the "cold grey dawn of the morning after." Disentangling, then, the normal peace-time trend from the abnormal war activity, and properly assessing each, is a task which must not be neglected. It must be done, too, before its recession into the past obscures the identity of the already tangled threads.

It may not be out of place to indicate a few examples of the operation and comparative significance of industrial happening in directing the general trend of our history. The first tilt in the next political campaign is already being fought, and it is rather interesting to observe that it centers around the question "whether we are as rich as we thought we were or whether we are as poor as we hope we are not." Somewhere between the reckless optimism of the one side and the shrewd and calculating pessimism of the other, the unbiased, well-balanced student may find the truth of economic fact, and put the deceivers, whichever they be or if both they be, to rout. The significant thing is that when the facts are established, their power will be almost irresistible.. Witness, will you not, the narrow escape of that comprehensive program of social progress from threatened wreckage in our last legislature, when it faced price declines in cotton and tobacco. I dare say that as lifeless a thing as the price curve of those commodities will be a more meaningful

decoration of the page of history which records that forward step than the facsimile of any political declaration.

There may be some difference of opinion as to the relative importance of the various indices of determining forces and the trend of dominant interest at the present time. Granting that when the economic equilibrium is upset the economic motive grips humanity most powerfully, there can be little possible disagreement concerning the portent of a Southern Tariff Congress meeting in Greensboro, of scores of thousands of cooperative marketing contracts with teeth in them, or the Electric Power controversy, or a declaration of affiliation between the Farmers Union and the State Federation of Labor. (Announced day before yesterday and given two inches of space in one of our leading daily papers.) Around each of these and a host of others which might be mentioned is a halo of related fact and pregnant circumstance rich in historical content.

In the less well-defined but more difficult field of slow change and gradual cumulative development, there are greater opportunities for far-sighted interpretation. The relation of expanding road mileage and motor transportation to social and civic life should be measured, analyzed, and stated. The passing of the first generation of cotton mill workers drawn from the individualistic mountaineer farmers and the tenants of the Piedmont region, and the ascendancy of their children, reared under strong group influences and numerous social restrictions, will give an impetus to class unity and economic friction, which will color our future in beauty or in blood. If our social policy be based on broad and thorough analysis of the facts and tendencies, then in beauty, but if it follows lines of ignorance or prejudice, then in blood.

As we launch further and further into the complexities of this more highly industrialized and class conscious life we shall lose irreparably, if we leave the way by which we came uncharted by full and accurate description and sound interpretation. The issues of the transition cannot long be evaded or postponed and the historian must perform his task with promptness and consecration.

Some fine examples of work in this field are already available. The quality of Dr. Hamilton's chapters on economic conditions in his treatise on Reconstruction is worthy of imitation in other periods, and Mitchell's "Rise of the Cotton Industry in the South" certainly should prove a fine seed-bed for a more thorough-going treatise on the same subject in this state. An increasing number of biographical studies are appearing in which constructive business achievement takes its place alongside political statesmanship. In "A Builder of the New South," Doctor

Winston has made an evaluation in terms of an industrial romance which should be the beginning of a series. The choice articles in economic history appearing in the South Atlantic Quarterly should also be mentioned in this connection.

But fine as these are, they are mere scraps in a long and varied story. Let me indicate a few general lines each of which will require a host of monographs. The history of agriculture would be full of solid value and rich in basic tendencies. Doubtless dramatic possibilities, too would recur with surprising frequency in such far reaching matters as the competition of slave labor, "poor white trash," and the small farmers of the Piedmont and mountain sections, not to speak of the tragedy of the tenant farmer of the later day. The perennial stock-law controversy and the activities of the Farmers Alliance and The Farmers Union would explain many a piece of cloak-room strategy in legislative domain. More important but less spectacular would be the long and stubborn fight against the law of diminishing returns in the use of agricultural land, with victory assured only by the enlistment of that increasing array of scientific farmers armed with crop rotaton, seed selection, soil analysis and similar up-to-date weapons. The evolution of transportation should also be full of interest, for here have appeared extremes of forward movement and stagnant isolation. Some of the earliest and best railroads were built within our state and few commonwealths can show a more interesting history of public ownership in this field. Some historian could well afford to give us facts about such things as freight discriminations, state rate regulation, "lost provinces," the good roads movement, motor transportation and its effect socially and economically. Shall the youth of the future as he purchases gas at a wayside station not have his contempt softened by the knowledge that here a country store once furnished his forbears their choicest social centre and their most effective political forum? Our present pride in the federal revenue records of our tobacco industry ought to create more definite curiosity concerning the early struggles of this giant industry. And who could withstand the desire to know the epic of that formerly blighted area—"The Sandhills"—after a journey through its blooming and blushing orchards, vineyards, and melon fields? Would it be heresy to say that in the articles of agreement between striking laborers and stubborn capitalists may be a more profound and significant index of the future than in any declaration of political independence? Many more such lines of research and interpretation might be enum-

erated but these few indicate the amount of light which may be thrown by economic happening on the nature of the seed-bed of social progress and political evolution.

The intricately interwoven and mutually interacting elements make it a difficult task, but drab and uninspiring at first sight, the richness of content which would soon appear will bring adequate compensation not to speak of its value in giving soundings in dangerous waters and in charting the safe course for the future of the state. May I thus challenge you to the gathering of the raw materials for the production of the constituent parts of a comprehensive industrial history of North Carolina which will rival in fascination and stirring movement the record of any other phase of our life? Some later master hand must have these strong and varied threads if he is to weave a sound basic fabric in the unending tapestry of our state's achievement.

Members of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina

Junius G. Adams, Asheville
Dr. Randolph G. Adams, Durham
A. E. Akers, Roanoke Rapids
W. H. Albright, Liberty
Charles L. Alexander, Charlotte
Miss Julia Alexander, Charlotte
Miss Violet Alexander, Charlotte
A. T. Allen, Salisbury
Ivey Allen, Louisburg
Mrs. George Alston, Raleigh
Dr. Albert Anderson, Raleigh
Mrs. John H. Anderson, Fayetteville
A. B. Andrews, Raleigh
Mrs. A. B. Andrews, Raleigh
Miss Augusta Andrews, Raleigh
Miss Jane Andrews, Raleigh
Miss Martha Andrews, Raleigh
William J. Andrews, Raleigh
Mrs. William J. Andrews, Raleigh
W. J. Armfield, High Point
Rev. C. A. Ashby, Raleigh
Capt. S. A. Ashe, Raleigh
Mrs. D. M. Ausley, Statesville
E. F. Aydlette, Elizabeth City
Mrs. Henry T. Bahnson, Winston-Salem
Miss Mattie H. Bailey, Raleigh
Mrs. A. L. Baker, Raleigh
Rev. M. A. Barber, Raleigh
George Gordon Battle, New York City
S. Westray Battle, Asheville
Mrs. S. Westray Battle, Asheville
Thomas H. Battle, Rocky Mount
A. P. Bauman, Raleigh
E. C. Beddingfield, Raleigh
John D. Bellamy, Wilmington
Mrs. T. W. Bickett, Raleigh
J. Crawford Biggs, Raleigh
Mrs. J. Crawford Biggs, Raleigh
Miss Anna M. Blair, Monroe
J. J. Blair, Raleigh
William A. Blair, Winston-Salem
Mrs. C. P. Blalock, Raleigh
O. G. Boisseau, Holden, Mo.
Hon. W. M. Bond, Edenton
John M. Booker, Chapel Hill
Louis M. Bourne, Asheville
J. D. Boushall, Raleigh
John H. Boushall, Raleigh
Stephen Bragaw, Washington
Dr. E. C. Branson, Chapel Hill
J. C. Braswell, Rocky Mount
W. E. Breese, Brevard
Dr. Charles E. Brewer, Raleigh
Miss Elizabeth Briggs, Raleigh
W. G. Briggs, Raleigh
T. H. Briggs, Raleigh
Mrs. T. H. Briggs, Raleigh
Hon. S. M. Brinson, Washington, D. C.
Col. J. L. Bridgers, Tarboro
Miss Kate Broadfoot, Fayetteville
L. C. Brogden, Raleigh
Mrs. A. L. Brooks, Greensboro
F. H. Brooks, Smithfield
Miss Carrie Broughton, Raleigh
J. M. Broughton, Raleigh
Dr. F. C. Brown, Durham
Joseph G. Brown, Raleigh
Col. J. F. Bruton, Wilson
Mrs. John F. Bruton, Wilson
J. Dempsey Bullock, Wilson
A. L. Bulwinkle, Gastonia
Hon. W. P. Bynum, Greensboro
Col. Bennehan Cameron, Stagville
Mrs. Bennehan Cameron, Stagville
Miss Rebecca Cameron, Hillsboro
J. O. Carr, Wilmington
Gen. Julian S. Carr, Durham
W. F. Carr, Durham
Bishop Jos. B. Cheshire, Raleigh
Mrs. Joseph B. Cheshire, Raleigh
Joseph B. Cheshire, Jr., Raleigh
Mrs. J. E. Clark, Washington
Hon. Walter Clark, Raleigh
Collier Cobb, Chapel Hill
Mrs. R. L. Cobb, Tarboro
Mrs. E. M. Cole, Charlotte
Mrs. Will X. Coley, Raleigh
Miss Jenn Winslow Coltrane, Concord

Andrew J. Conner, Rich Square
Hon. H. G. Connor, Wilson
Mrs. H. G. Connor, Wilson
R. D. W. Connor, Chapel Hill
Charles L. Coon, Wilson
W. R. Coppedge, Rockingham
J. H. Cordon, Raleigh
Mrs. J. H. Cordon, Raleigh
J. M. Costner, Raleigh
Bruce Cotten, Baltimore
R. R. Cotten, Bruce
Mrs. R. R. Cotten, Bruce
G. V. Cowper, Kinston
Col. Albert L. Cox, Raleigh
Miss Clara I. Cox, High Point
J. Elwood Cox, High Point
Burton Craige, Winston-Salem
W. J. Craig, Wilmington
W. C. Cram, Raleigh
W. C. Cram, Jr., Raleigh
Mrs. Ethel T. Crittenden, Wake Forest
Mrs. A. B. Croom, Jr., Wilmington
E. B. Crow, Raleigh
Ernest Cruikshank, Columbia, Tenn.
F. B. Dancy, Baltimore, Md.
W. E. Daniel, Weldon
Hon. F. A. Daniels, Goldsboro
Hon. Josephus Daniels, Raleigh
E. L. Baxter Davidson, Charlotte
Miss May Hill Davis, Raleigh
Miss Penelope Davis, Raleigh
Miss Sallie Joyner Davis, Greenville
Thomas W. Davis, Wilmington
Miss Daisy Denson, Raleigh
L. A. Denson, Raleigh
Miss Mary F. DeVane, Goldsboro
Clyde Douglass, Raleigh
Rev. John Jordan Douglass, Wadesboro
Rev. Robert B. Drane, Edenton
Mrs. E. C. Duncan, Raleigh
Mrs. L. P. Duncan, Raleigh
J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Elizabeth City
Theo. G. Empie, Wilmington
Mrs. Sadie Smedes Erwin, Durham
R. O. Everett, Durham
W. N. Everett, Rockingham
H. E. Faison, Clinton
Mrs. I. W. Faison, Charlotte
Miss Winifred Faison, Faison
Rev. J. S. Farmer, Raleigh
Hon. G. S. Ferguson, Waynesville
W. W. Flowers, Durham
Mrs. J. A. Fore, Charlotte
J. L. Fountain, Raleigh
Mrs. J. L. Fountain, Raleigh
Dr. J. I Foust, Greensboro
Mrs. Samuel Fowle, Washington
Miss Adelaide Fries, Winston-Salem
Col. John W. Fries, Winston-Salem
H. E. Fries, Winston-Salem
Miss Susan Fulghum, Goldsboro
T. B. Fuller, Durham
E. L. Gaither, Mocksville
Hon. S. M.. Gattis, Hillsboro
Dr. W. H. Glasson, Durham
Mrs. George C. Goodman, Mooresville
E. McK. Goodwin, Morganton
Henry A. Grady, Clinton
Hon. A. W. Graham, Oxford
Miss Mary O. Graham, Raleigh
Hon. W. A. Graham, Raleigh
Mrs. William A. Graham, Edenton
Miss Isabel Graves, Mount Airy
James A. Gray, Winston-Salem
Mrs. James A. Gray
H. T. Greenleaf, Elizabeth City
Miss Lennie Greenlee, Old Fort
R. L. Greenlee, Marion
Greensboro Public Library, Greensboro
Mrs. B. H. Griffin, Raleigh
I. C. Griffin, Shelby
Lee Griffin, Monroe
Col. J. Bryan Grimes, Raleigh
Mrs. Gordon Hackett, North Wilkesboro
Hon. E. J. Hale, Fayetteville
B. F. Hall, Wilmington
Miss Susan E. Hall, Wilmington
William C. Hammer, Ashboro
Dr. J. G. deR. Hamilton, Chapel Hill
Miss Rosa Hamilton, Clayton
Dr. Ira M. Hardy, Kinston
C. J. Harris, Asheville
Mrs. J. C. L. Harris, Raleigh
Dr. Thomas P. Harrison, Raleigh
Mrs. Thomas P. Harrison, Raleigh
C. Felix Harvey, Kinston

Mrs. C. Felix Harvey, Kinston
Ernest Haywood, Raleigh
F. P. Haywood, Raleigh
M. DeL. Haywood, Raleigh
R. W. Haywood, Raleigh
Mrs. John S. Henderson, Salisbury
F. R. Hewitt, Asheville
Miss Georgia Hicks, Faison
Henry T. Hicks, Raleigh
T. T. Hicks, Henderson
Dr. D. H. Hill, Raleigh
John Sprunt Hill, Durham
Mrs. W. T. Hines, Kinston
Mrs. J. W. Hinsdale, Raleigh
Miss Mary Hilliard Hinton, Raleigh
L. L. Hobbs, Guilford College
Hon. W. A. Hoke, Raleigh
C. W. Horne, Clayton
Dr. H. H. Horne, New York City
J. A. Hoskins, Summerfield
George Howe, Chapel Hill
Rev. Andrew J. Howell, Whiteville
D. E. Hudgins, Marion
Rev. A. B. Hunter, Raleigh
Carey J. Hunter, Raleigh
Mrs. Carey J. Hunter, Raleigh
J. Rufus Hunter, Raleigh
Miss Louise Irby, Greensboro
Miss Carrie M. Jackson, Pittsboro
Mrs. H. W. Jackson, Richmond, Va.
W. C. Jackson, Greensboro
B. S. Jerman, Raleigh
Col. Charles E. Johnson, Raleigh
Mrs. Charles E. Johnson, Raleigh
Charles E. Johnson, Jr., Raleigh
Miss Mary Lynch Johnson, Raleigh
Mrs. Katherine S. Johnston, Winston-Salem
Southgate Jones, Durham
W. N. Jones, Raleigh
Z. K. Justice, Davidson
Miss Elizabeth A. Kelly, Raleigh
Woodus Kellum, Wilmington
Paul S. Kennett, Elon College
Horace Kephart, Bryson City
B. W. Kilgore, Raleigh
Robert R. King, Greensboro
F. H. Koch, Chapel Hill
Col. Wilson G. Lamb, Williamston
Dr. W. T. Laprade, Durham
William Latimer, Wilmington
J. B. Lewis, Raleigh
Dr. R. H. Lewis, Raleigh
Thomas W. Lingle, Davidson
S. Lipinsky, Asheville
Henry E. Litchford, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. H. A. London, Pittsboro
H. M. London, Raleigh
Mrs. H. M. London, Raleigh
C. C. McAlister, Fayetteville
Miss Mary McClellan, Raleigh
J. G. McCormick, Wilmington
J. G. McCormick, Wilmington
J. R. McCrary, Lexington
Mrs. M. G. McCubbins, Salisbury
Mrs. Herbert McCullers, Clayton
F. B. McDowell, Charlotte
A. C. McIntosh, Chapel Hill
Mrs. Charles McKimmon, Raleigh
W. B. McKoy, Wilmington
A. W. McLean, Lumberton
R. L. McMillan, Raleigh
Mrs. R. L. McMillan, Raleigh
Franklin McNeill, Raleigh
Mrs. Franklin McNeill, Raleigh
Donald McRae, Wilmington
Mrs. T. F. Malloy, Asheville
A. G. Mangum, Gastonia
Clement Manly, Winston-Salem
W. F. Marshall, Raleigh
Mrs. B. Frank Mebane, Spray
Mrs. L. J. Mewborne, Kinston
Mrs. J. W. Miller, New York City
Mrs. J. J. Misenheimer, Charlotte
Mrs. E. E. Moffitt, Richmond, Va.
Judge W. A. Montgomery, Raleigh
Mrs. James P. Moore, Salisbury
Rev. W. W. Moore, Richmond, Va.
John M. Morehead, Charlotte
Mrs. John M. Morehead, Charlotte
Mrs. F. O. Moring, Raleigh
Mrs. Theo. S. Morrison, Asheville
Hugh Morson, Raleigh
Mrs. Beverly G. Moss, Washington
Miss Lucile W. Murchison, New York City
Mrs. Lucy Warren Myers, Washington
Frank Nash, Raleigh

Q. K. Nimocks, Fayetteville
Eric Norden, Wilmington
Mrs. M. T. Norris, Raleigh
G. A. Norwood, Goldsboro
Jonas Oettinger, Wilson
Hon. Lee S. Overman, Salisbury
Miss Mary B. Palmer, Raleigh
John A. Parker, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. C. M. Parks, Tarboro
Miss Rosa Paschal, Greenville
Mrs. J. Lindsey Patterson, Winston-Salem
Mrs. S. T. Peace, Henderson
P. Pearsall, Wilmington
Dr. C. C. Pearson, Wake Forest
Mrs. George Pell, Raleigh
Mrs. R. L. Penn, Mount Airy
E. F. Pescud, Raleigh
Miss Annie F. Petty, Greensboro
William S. Pfohl, Winston-Salem
H. N. Pharr, Charlotte
Miss Cordelia Phifer, Charlotte
Mrs. H. C. Pinnix, Oxford
T. M. Pittman, Henderson
Mrs. Charles M. Platt, Asheville
Dr. Clarence Poe, Raleigh
Mrs. Clarence Poe, Raleigh
J. E. Pogue, Raleigh
Tasker Polk, Warrenton
Miss Eliza Pool, Raleigh
Dr. Hubert Poteat, Wake Forest
Miss Ida Poteat, Raleigh
Dr. W. L. Poteat, Wake Forest
Mrs. W. L. Poteat, Wake Forest
Mrs. W. H. Potter, Boston, Mass.
E. K. Powe, Durham
Mrs. E. K. Powe, Durham
W. R. Powell, Wake Forest
Mrs. W. R. Powell, Wake Forest
Col. Joseph Hyde Pratt, Chapel Hill
Mrs. I. M. Proctor, Raleigh
James H. Ramsay, Salisbury
George J. Ramsey, Raleigh
E. E. Randolph, Raleigh
Mrs. R. B. Raney, Raleigh
W. S. Rankin, Raleigh
W. T. Reaves, Raleigh
Miss Mattie Reese, Raleigh
Mrs. W. N. Reynolds, Winston-Salem
Dr. W. C. Riddick, Raleigh
Dr. Paul H. Ringer, Asheville
Miss Lida T. Rodman, Washington
Rev. Howard E. Rondthaler, Winston-Salem
Mrs. Howard E. Rondthaler, Winston-Salem
Charles Root, Raleigh
Ralph Rosenberg, Asheville
Mrs. Ralph Rosenberg, Asheville
Mrs. Maurice Rosenthal, Raleigh
Hon. George Rountree, Wilmington
Dr. H. A. Royster, Raleigh
Dr. W. I. Royster, Raleigh
William H. Ruffin, Louisburg
Robert L. Ryburn, Shelby
W. M. Sanders, Smithfield
Paul W. Schenck, Greensboro
Joe Seawell, Raleigh
Miss. C. L. Shaffner, Winston-Salem
Miss Cornelia Shaw, Davidson
Shaw University, Raleigh
Mrs. M. B. Sherwood, Raleigh
Mrs. M. B. Shipp, Raleigh
John A. Simpson, Raleigh
Harry Skinner, Greenville
Dr. Benjamin Sledd, Wake Forest
Hon. J. H. Small, Washington
Dr. C. Alphonso Smith, Annapolis, Md.
Dr. Charles Lee Smith, Raleigh
Ed Chambers Smith, Raleigh
Mrs. Ed Chambers Smith, Raleigh
Miss Mary Shannon Smith, New York City
Miss Mildred Smith, Raleigh
W. A. Smith, Ansonville
Willis Smith, City
Dr. D. T. Smithwick, Louisburg
Mrs. D. T. Smithwick, Louisburg
Mrs. W. O. Spencer, Winston-Salem
F. S. Spruill, Rocky Mount
Dr. James Sprunt, Wilmington
W. H. Sprunt, Wilmington
J. F. Stanback, Raleigh
Mrs. J. F. Stanback, Raleigh
Hon. Charles M. Stedman, Greensboro
George Stephens, Charlotte
C. L. Stevens, Southport,
Mrs. C. L. Stevens, Southport

Mrs. F. L. Stevens, Urbana, Ill.
Edward L. Stewart, Washington
W. E. Stone, Raleigh
Edmund Strudwick, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. Edmund Strudwick, Richmond, Va.
R. C. Strudwick, Greensboro
Hon. R. H. Sykes, Durham
Mrs. J. F. Taylor, Kinston
Frank Thompson, Jacksonville
Mrs. Jacksie Danields Thrash, Tarboro
Walter D. Toy, Chapel Hill
E. J. Tucker, Roxboro
Tuesday Afternoon Reading Club, Reidsville
Mrs. V. E. Turner, Raleigh
Miss Cornelia Vanderbilt, Biltmore
Mrs. John Van Landingham, Charlotte
Rev. R. T. Vann, Raleigh
C. L. Van Noppen, Greensboro
Mrs. C. L. Van Noppen, Greensboro
Dr. C. G. Vardell, Red Springs
Mrs. W. W. Vass, Raleigh
W. W. Vass, Raleigh
Wachovia Historical Society, Winston-Salem
Mrs. Amos. J. Walker, New York City
Mrs. J. A. Walker, Brownwood, Texas
Zebulon V. Walser, Lexington
D. L. War, New Bern
J. L. Webb, Shelby
Miss Gertrude Weil, Goldsboro
Mrs. W. S. West, Raleigh
Charles Whedbee, Hertford
Miss Julia S. White, Guilford College
Mrs. E. L. Whitehead, Enfield
J. Frank Wilkes, Charlotte
M. S. Willard, Wilmington
F. L. Willcox, Florence, S. C.
L. A. Williams, Chapel Hill
R. R. Williams, Asheville
S. E. Williams, Lexington
William H. Williamson, Raleigh
J. Norman Wills, Greensboro
H. V. Wilson, Chapel Hill
Dr. Louis R. Wilson, Chapel Hill
J. W. Winborne, Marion
Mrs. J. M. Winfree, Raleigh
Hon. Francis D. Winston
Hon. George T. Winston, Asheville
Hon. R. W. Winston, Raleigh
J. H. Wisler, Moncure
Dr. W. A. Withers, Raleigh
Frank Wood, Edenton
J. G. Wood, Edenton
Mrs. F. A. Woodard, Wilson
W. F. Woodard, Wilson
Mrs. W. F. Woodard, Wilson
E. E. Wright, New Orleans, La.
W. H. Yarborough, Louisburg
J. R. Young, Raleigh